Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-059
Wednesday
27 March 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-059 *27 March 1991*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: As of 13 March 1991, Moscow domestic radio sourcelines in the DAILY REPORT will reflect how a station identifies itself. This change eliminates the "Domestic Service" designation in favor of the station identification as broadcast. The presence of a new radio sourceline reflects this change in policy, rather than the establishment of a new station or network.

An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Ignatenko on Ozawa-Gorbachev Meeting, Borders *[TASS]* 1
Gorbachev Said To Reassess European Policy *[IAN PRESS RELEASE]* 2
Zagladin on European Security *[Moscow International]* 3
European Security System Viewed *[Moscow Radio]* 3
Gulf War Seen as Weapons 'Testing Ground' *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 21 Mar]* 4
Foreign Banks Form Association in Moscow *[IZVESTIYA 22 Mar]* 6

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Northeast Asia

Japan's Ozawa Continues Visit to Moscow 7
Meets With Gorbachev 26 Mar *[TASS]* 7
Discusses Territorial Concerns *[Tokyo KYODO]* 7
Meets With Ivashko *[TASS]* 7
Japanese Premier Praises Talks *[TASS]* 7
Japanese Envoy Prepares for Gorbachev's Apr Visit 8
Meets Frolov *[PRAVDA 21 Mar]* 8
Sees Ivashko *[TASS]* 8
Gorbachev's Writings Published in Japan *[TASS]* 8

Near East & South Asia

Executions Follow Attempt on Saddam's Life *[Moscow International]* 8
Envoy to Afghanistan Praises Ties, Promises Aid *[Kabul Radio]* 8

East Europe

Troop Withdrawal Talks With Poland Viewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 Mar]* 9
Polish Company To Assist in Troops' Resettlement *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 23 Mar]* 9
Gorbachev Meets Visiting Polish Political Figure *[Moscow TV]* 10
Reports Note Walesa's Visit to Washington 10
Expectations on Debt Noted *[IZVESTIYA 22 Mar]* 10
Results Eyed *[PRAVDA 26 Mar]* 11
Troop Withdrawal From CSFR Ahead of Schedule *[TASS]* 11
Yugoslav Army's Pledge May Deter SFRY Unrest *[IZVESTIYA 23 Mar]* 12
Pact Military Representatives Hold Final Talks *[TASS]* 12

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Resolution on Suspending Coal Strikes *[PRAVDA 27 Mar]* 13
Implementation Required *[Moscow Radio]* 13
Penalties Rejected *[TASS]* 13

Deputies Stress Need for Mediation *[Moscow Radio]* 14
Bessmertnykh Briefs Gorbachev's Japan Visit *[TASS]* 15
French, Italian Treaties Detailed *[TASS]* 15
Deputies Debate Agricultural Problems *[IZVESTIYA 26 Mar]* 15

Political & Social

State of Emergency 'Increasingly Likely' *[TASS]* 16
Yeltsin Adviser Attacks Ban on Demonstrations *[Sofia BTA]* 17
Pavlov Issues Appeal Against Strikes, Riots *[TASS]* 17
Reaction to Demonstration Ban Reported *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 27 Mar]* 18
Bakatin Says Demonstration Ban Undemocratic *[Moscow Radio]* 19
Bakatin Urges Miners To Drop Political Demands *[TASS]* 20
Gorbachev Meets Agro-Industrial Representatives *[Moscow International]* 21
Further on Meeting *[Moscow Radio]* 21
Lukyanov on Importance of All-Union Referendum *[Moscow TV]* 21
Shatalin Hits Aspects of Draft Union Treaty *[IZVESTIYA 23 Mar]* 22
Metallurgy Workers Plan 'Unionwide Action' *[TRUD 26 Mar]* 23
Television Correspondent on 'Press Freedom' *[Budapest NEPSZAVA 22 Mar]* 23
Hunger Strike Protesting Appointment Continues *[IZVESTIYA 25 Mar]* 24
Gorbachev Aide Recommends Political 'Compromise' *[Rome LA REPUBBLICA 23 Mar]* ... 25
Alksnis Makes Case for 'Salvation' Coalition *[Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER 24 Mar]* 26
Shatalin Interviewed on Political Situation *[Paris LE FIGARO 16-17 Mar]* 28
Indications of Russian CP Purge Seen *[KOSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 23 Mar]* 29
Dzasokhov: Time Not Right for Party Debate *[PRAVDA 21 Mar]* 31
Politburo's Shenin on Communist Party *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Mar]* 31
Internal Troops Party Conference Held *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 23 Mar]* 34
Border Guard CPSU Organizations Hold Conference *[PRAVDA 27 Mar]* 35
Increased Disobedience Toward Moscow Police Noted *[Moscow Radio]* 35
Supreme Court Head on Problems in USSR Courts *[Moscow TV]* 36
MVD Official Reports Huge Growth in Crime *[TASS]* 36

Economic

Four Dnepropetrovsk Mines on Strike *[Moscow Radio]* 36
Donetsk Miners Appeal for Support *[Kiev International]* 37
No Compensation Planned for Non-State Bank Funds *[Moscow Radio]* 37
Private Control of Retail Trade Said Increasing *[Moscow International]* 37
Planning Chairman Warns of Economic Problems *[Moscow TV]* 37
World Bank Welcomes USSR Membership *[TASS]* 38
Metallurgy's 'Catastrophic Situation' Described *[PRAVDA 26 Mar]* 38

Agricultural

Stroyev Attends Livestock Feed Institute Seminar *[PRAVDA 23 Mar]* 39
Urgency of Spring Field Work Stressed *[TRUD 21 Mar]* 39
Decrease in Livestock Threatens 'Food Disaster' *[IZVESTIYA 15 Mar]* 40
Negligence in Grain Farming Activity Scored *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 21 Mar]* 41
Agricultural Equipment Problems Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 22 Mar]* 42

Scientific

Cosmos-2138 Satellite Launched, Operational *[TASS]* 44
Dzasokhov, Academicians Discuss Science Policy *[PRAVDA 20 Mar]* 44

Military

General Outlines Military Reform Plans *[TASS]* 45
Confiscated Weapons Put on Display *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 26 Mar]* 45

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Latvia, Poland Sign Cooperation Agreement *[Warsaw PAP]* 47
Estonia's Russian Deputies Appeal to RSFSR *[TASS]* 47
Estonian Troops Not To Serve Outside Republic *[Tallinn Radio]* 47
Lithuanian, USSR Maneuvers on Talks Reported 47
Lithuania Proposes Beginning Talks *[TASS]* 47
Lithuanians Wait for Reply *[Radio Vilnius]* 48
Doguzhiyev Proposes 26 Mar Talks *[Moscow Radio]* 48
Landsbergis on Meeting Cancellation *[Vilnius International]* 48
Radio Vilnius Reports Further OMON Violence 48
Pugo Promises To Investigate *[Radio Vilnius]* 49
Landsbergis on Year Since Independence Act *[EKHO LITVY 13 Mar]* 49
Lithuanian Supreme Council Appeals to Democracies *[Radio Vilnius]* 50
Lithuanian CP Issues Statement on Referendum *[TASS]* 50
New Lithuanian Security Chief Views Assignment *[Vilnius International]* 51
USSR Summonses for Lithuanians 'Not Binding' *[EKHO LITVY 13 Mar]* 51
Lithuanian Premier Details Price Increases *[TASS]* 51

RSFSR

Silayev Reportedly Offers Resignation 51
Says Yeltsin Probably Resigning *[Belgrade TANJUG]* 51
Remarks on Yeltsin 'Misunderstood' *[Belgrade TANJUG]* 52
USSR, Russian Reaction to Demonstration Ban 52
Tear Gas Use Against Rally Denied *[Moscow International]* 52
'Democratic Russia' To Demonstrate *[Radio Rossii]* 52
Pro-Yeltsin Rally Still on *[TASS]* 52
Moscow City Soviet Appeals Ban *[Moscow Radio]* 52
TASS Reports Reaction 53
Demonstrators 'Will Be Stopped' *[Moscow Radio]* 53
'Armored Troop Vehicles' in Moscow *[AFP]* 53
'No Armored Troop Carriers' *[TASS]* 53
TASS on Yeltsin's Prospects at Russian Congress 54
Khasbulatov Sees Yeltsin Win *[TASS]* 54
Silayev Briefs Journalists on Economic Measures *[Moscow Radio]* 55
Critical Fuel Situation in Maritime Kray *[Moscow Radio]* 56
Lukyanov Reads Referendum Results at Legislature *[Moscow TV]* 56

Western Republics

Referendum Participants in Kishinev 'Persecuted' *[IZVESTIYA 23 Mar]* 56
Romanian Foreign Minister Assesses Moldova Visit *[Bucharest ROMPRES]* 57
Moldovan Counterpart Views Visit *[Bucharest ROMPRES]* 57
Last Romanian Warsaw Pact Representative Departs *[TASS]* 57
Belorussian National Front Congress Held 25 Mar *[Minsk Radio]* 58

Caucasus

S. Ossetian CP Appeals to Gorbachev on Violence *[Moscow International]* 58
Georgia's Gamsakhurdia Sums Talks With Yeltsin *[TASS]* 58
Georgia Fails To Recognize Referendum Results *[Moscow Radio]* 59
Economic Problems, Incidents in NKAO Noted *[Yerevan Radio]* 59
TASS Details Incidents 59

Ignatenko on Ozawa-Gorbachev Meeting, Borders

LD2603183191 Moscow TASS in English 1809 GMT 26 Mar 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow March 26 TASS—There was the second meeting today between President Mikhail Gorbachev and visiting here Japanese Liberal Democratic Party leader Ichiro Ozawa.

Soviet presidential spokesman Vitaliy Ignatenko said at a briefing in the Soviet Foreign Ministry Press Centre today that the Soviet side attaches much importance to the visit, "being aware that it is being held in connection with Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Japan".

The spokesman expressed confidence that the forthcoming visit by the Soviet president to Tokyo would be a "mission of friendship" and a manifestation of "respect for the Japanese people".

"The visit will confirm the Soviet Union's sincere desire to develop relations with Japan in all directions", taking into account "difficulties left by history and the context in which Russian- Japanese and Soviet-Japanese relations developed".

Ignatenko noted that the new situation in the world "somehow by- passes relations between our countries". Soviet-Japanese relations incurred "great losses both in the political and economic spheres, which should be recouped quickly".

He added that it is necessary "to bring relations between the USSR and Japan to the level of Soviet relations with major countries, with which we now have very favourable relations".

Ignatenko said that at his meeting with Ozawa, Gorbachev referred to the only obstacle—the issue of the northern territories. The Japanese visitor agreed with this viewpoint.

Gorbachev noted that this issue should be approached, its existence should not be denied. All aspects of this issue, developing historically, should be taken into account, the president said.

It is necessary to cooperate and meet each other halfway. "We should look for ways to enrich our relations, including new elements in them."

Gorbachev stressed that it is high time to abandon "rock-firm positions and to make our relations good-neighbourly and worthy of the two countries".

Ignatenko refuted rumours about plans to sell the Soviet islands of the Kurile chain for 28 billion dollars to Japan. "No sums or issues of economic cooperation" were discussed, he said.

Asked whether the Japanese side offered any information that it would be ready to retreat somehow from its position on the four islands and possibly agree to their return one-by-one, Ignatenko said that this question was not discussed tactically.

"The sides discussed it theoretically. They took into account the fact that this issue exists and that it must be settled by all means.

"Gorbachev said that he was now seeking advise from his close aides, institutes and Foreign Ministry officials so that we could discuss the issue of the northern territories fruitfully enough," the spokesman noted.

Ignatenko informed reporters that U.S. Ambassador Jack Matlock conveyed George Bush's letter to Gorbachev on Monday. The spokesman said that the letter is a "follow-up of talks held by James Baker in Moscow".

The letter sets out, in a constructive form, problems, which should be settled by the two countries.

According to Ignatenko, the letter does not mention the dating of the Soviet-American summit, but he believes that the summit will be held (as was planned) in the first half of 1991.

Asked about the date of a visit to the USSR by Romanian President Ion Iliescu, Ignatenko said that the visit would be held in the near future.

He also confirmed that the Polish president and prime minister would soon visit the Soviet Union. The exact dates were not set, but they will come in the spring.

Turning to the issue of U.S. "permanent military presence" in the Gulf, Ignatenko noted: "I assure you that we treat the situation very seriously, and our Defence Ministry is studying it. We shall have an idea very soon what is going on in that region".

Reporters again raised the question about the recognition of the Soviet pre-war borders by the United States. Ignatenko said that he had nothing to add to what was said by his Foreign Ministry colleague on Monday.

Speaking about Washington's non-recognition of the incorporation of the Baltics and "the northern territories" into the USSR, the spokesman said: "We cannot agree to the arbitrary cutting of the USSR's territory and its mapping within the 1933 borders.

"This is an old page of history. This was corroborated by the Helsinki agreement signed by all member states, including the U.S. president. It is unacceptable to us to regard our country within borders, which do not conform to reality."

Gorbachev Said To Reassess European Policy

PM2603162791 Moscow IAN PRESS RELEASE in English (Undated)

[Reprint "in full" of article by Vladimir Razuvayev, in NEZAVISMAYA GAZETA, No. 32 : "Forgive Us, Europe. The Anticipation of the Cold War"]

[Text] Some time ago, the president stopped using the term "common European home". Previously, however, this phrase often figured in the state officials' speeches, while its luring content made it extremely popular among Soviet citizens. Its disappearance from the president's vocabulary went unnoticed at first, as besides Gorbachev there were enough people who went on pronouncing the three words reflecting the Soviet Union's new approach to the Old World's affairs. The president's silence has continued far too long, however, and analysts legitimately try to understand what stands behind such forgetfulness: accident, the renovation of the Soviet diplomacy's vocabulary, or adjustments (or, perhaps, serious changes) in the Soviet foreign policy.

It was clear from the beginning that the lot of the new term would not be easy not simply because in the West people prefer to live in homes of their own and not in common homes. The definition "European" seemed to imply the wish to press out such participants in the European Conference on Security and Cooperation as the US and Canada from the regional political process. I do not think the West was overjoyed by such a way of raising the question. Perhaps, with good reason.

At least none other than Eduard Shevardnadze confessed recently that previously Moscow had planned to cut off the US from its Western European allies. Was not this particular idea one of the covert motives for proclaiming the idea of a common European home? If this is really so, luckily for the Soviet diplomacy and for the soviet leaders' image in the West, these hopes had covertly lived for some time and then peacefully died. No doubt, the Soviet national interests are quite consonant with the idea of partial pressing out the US from Europe.

However, any of the Soviet diplomats' moves in this direction would inevitably backfire. This can be clearly seen from the Soviet Union's foreign policies in the post-war period. Besides that, the Soviet leadership's "new thinking" would have hardly been so strongly supported in the West or brought such impressive results if through it one could clearly see the claws of the Russian bear, i.e. the traditional goals of the Soviet foreign policy.

The idea of a common European home aroused definite suspicion in the West, among other reasons, because it did not fit into the existing mechanisms and institutions similar to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. It was not clear whether Moscow was proposing to replace them with something new (with what specifically?) or whether the "something new" would function parallel, or absorb the conference (how then?).

The problem was that behind the impressive name there was no equally impressive concept. Perhaps it did not exist at all. Since Lenin's time, the Soviet Union has adjusted its policies to attractive slogans, not the other way round. Decades after, this tendency projected itself on the nuclear-free world program and on the programme for providing every family with a home of its own. By the way, there were plans to attain both goals by the year 2000. The peripeteia of the well-known formual, "acceleration - perestroika - openness" prove that the Kremlin has remained faithful to the old approach.

However, it is and whatever doubts may have been expressed in the Western political circles, the new notion was received quite favourably abroad, for even basic linguistic analysis showed that Moscow's intentions were good, so why worry about the merits and demerits of its diplomatic language? Soon this term became an inseparable element of the Gorbachev dictionary of Soviet foreign policy. It was precisely in 1990, however, at what seemed to be the peak of new relations between the USSR and the West, that the words "common European home" began to be used increasingly rarely by Moscow and then totally disappeared from the president's public addresses.

Only a few years ago the Soviet leadership believed that the new Europe would be made up of two "halves" competing on equal terms (in the political and military spheres anyway). The East European revolutions put an end to these illusions and also to the hopes of "joining up with Europe" as an influential and equal partner. It has also turned out that neither the European Community nor other West European institutions are particularly eager to integrate immediately the huge Soviet Union with its crumbling economy and an administrative system totaly alien to the Western world.

It is possible that the lexical modification of Soviet foreign policy is associated with a reaction to the purely external factors. It is doubtless, however, that Gorbachev's gesture has been caused first of all by a reassessement of the tasks of Soviet foreign policy. After the re-unification of Germany the USSR has received - for some time anyway - a very precious ally or at least hopes for such an ally in the centre of Europe. Bearing in mind the restrained reaction of the European Community to the Soviet initiatives and the changes in Eastern Europe, Moscow is apparently gradually changing the accents in its European policy, concentrating on relations with the key Western nations.

It is beyond any doubt that Gorbachev's lexicon has been affected, too, by the conservative tilt in the USSR's home political affairs. Nor is it a secret that the Kremlin leadership has been extremely annoyed by the Western stand on the issue of credit and help to the USSR. Finally, one should bear in mind such a marginal but also important fact from the viewpoint of real politics as the extreme undesirability of the use of the term

"common European home" today. This is because it can only evoke a negative reaction in West Europe after the events in the Baltics....

I think that the inevitable cooling in the relations between Moscow and West, already beginning, although its signs are not yet so obvious, will naturally affect not only the lexicon of Soviet diplomacy. The problem is not in the trend that, unfortunately, is objective and must be recognized as an inevitable evil. The problem is the limits this trend can go. Beyond one of these limits the Kremlin and the West will cease to understand each other and will return to the language of the "cold war". Will they apologize then to each other for the lost illusions?

Zagladin on European Security

LD2303130291 Moscow World Service in English 0810 GMT 23 Mar 91

[Text] Next we bring the main points of an interview given to our reporter by Dr. Vadim Zagladin, Chairman of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation. He's also an advisor to the Soviet President. When asked what in his opinion blocks the building of a new system of European security (?or) contributes to this process Dr. Vadim Zaghladin explained:

(?He said) the building of (?the) new all-European system of security is a much talked of subject today, Dr. Zagladin said. This is hardly surprising. At a summit in Paris last year documents were signed that gave a green light to the development of such a system. Perhaps, however, the reaction of the time to this event was too euphoric, though without question the event was important and the decision was historic. But Europe still has to go a long way before a new security system is built there. So far its legal contours are beginning to take shape. Another seminar on military doctrines is due to be held. Also a center for preventing military conflicts has been set up and a permanent secretariat for the all-European process has been established in Prague.

But these are all just organizational steps that lay the foundation for future work. In reality the building of new system is not a matter for the imminent future. In reality the building of new system is not a matter for the imminent future. I'd say, Dr. Zagladin went on, it's a time-consuming process, first of all because no one knows in full measure so far what this system should look like. Up to recently security in Europe was ensured against the background of the confrontation between the two military blocs, the Warsaw Treaty Organization, now receding into history, and NATO remaining intact.

But the two alliances no longer oppose each other. What's more a new organization will be formed in Western Europe to deal with the problems of security. By transforming into a political union, the European Communities are likely to take upon themselves certain commitments as far as security is concerned.

As for Eastern Europe, Dr. Zagladin went on, the Warsaw Treaty has disintegrated but new organizations are in the process of formation. A community of Balkan states is being formed, the three states Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary have reached an agreement on security problems between themselves. Finally the preparation is underway in a series of agreements between the Soviet Union and East European countries, our allies in the past. These agreements will cover security questions as well. So these are partial structures developing in various parts of Europe. As soon as they will show themselves the building of all-European cooperation structures may be launched on their basis. Dr. Zagaldin continued: There is also another difficulty, Dr. Zagladin, the president's adviser, said. There exist destabilizing elements on the European continent. This applies to eastern and south east Europe first and foremost. There's also elements of political, economic, and social instability, and surfacing in Germany too. The unificaiton of the two Germanies has given rise to many difficult problems of a social and economic anture. In other words there still exists a series of political problems in various countries that slow down to a certain degree the efforts aimed at building an all-European security system. It's true the existence of such problems will stimulate the appearance of a new security system on the continent. In this context Dr. Zagladin referred to a recent seminar on peaceful settlements of disputes held by experts of the European security conference.

He suggested that the existing elements of instability aroused concern of participants in the all-European process and this is bound to speed up the formation of security structures on the continent. I think, Dr. Zagladin said in conclusion, that we'll be entering another century with a new security structure in Europe, if not finalized, then certainly well under construction. This will have a favorable impact on every European country (?and on) the peoples of the continent as a whole.

European Security System Viewed

LD2303185991 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1330 GMT 23 Mar 91

[Commentary by political observer Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Text] Last week was marked by a whole series of important European meetings. Moscow, as you know, was visited by the foreign ministers of the FRG, Great Britain, and Romania. In Paris there was a meeting between the presidents of France and Germany. The headquarters of the European Community NATO in Brussels were visited by President Havel of Czechoslovakia. Our political observer Aleksandr Zholkver comments on the subject matter of these meetings. Over to him.

[Zholkver] Each of these meetings did, of course, have its own specific features concerning mutual relations between the European states involved. Nevertheless it

seems to me that one can pick out the main and common feature that was, perhaps, characteristic of all these talks, conducted at the very highest level. It was a question of the direction Europe would move in the future. It is now, as it were, at the crossroads. The cold war seems to have ended. The new political thinking, rejecting the preeminence of military force, is emerging. The old bloc structure is collapsing, and the foundations for a new all-European security system are being laid. Specifically, the European center for the prevention of military conflicts, just opening in Vienna, is to become an important body in it.

Nevertheless, the all-European process is finding it hard going, and is far from simple. Let us take that same question of the destiny of the military blocs in Europe. As is known, the military structures of the Warsaw treaty organization are already being abolished. What about NATO? Very sharp discussions are going on about this at the moment. In London, quite a stir was caused by the recent statement by Alan Clark, minister for defence procurement, to the effect that—and I quote—NATO had accomplished its initial aims, and the bloc's existence was now pointless.

However, the head of British diplomacy seems to take a different view on the subject. At any rate, on the eve of his visit to Moscow he found it necessary to point out that any actions leading, as he put it, to the conversion of NATO into an empty phrase would inevitably entail a review in Washington of the question of the expediency of maintaining a U.S. military presence in Europe—and that, as Hurd emphasized, was vitally important from the security point of view. Admittedly, during the talks with his Soviet counterpart, Douglas Hurd said he favored the expansion and deepening of the Helsinki process in all directions, and the improvement of the mechanism of all-European cooperation.

These questions are also being vigorously debated now by Germany and France, including at presidential levels. To judge from the latest reports from Paris, both sides have initiated a reinterpretation of the whole roll of NATO, and primarily of its military doctrines. Under discussion specifically is the question of whether two commands should be set up in NATO—an American and a European one—and whether the military structures of the West European Union should be used for liaison between them. Also being debated is the issue of the expansion of NATO's zone of action, already being mentioned during the war in the Persian Gulf.

Incidentally, the expansion of NATO's zone of action is certainly being thought of by some not just in the direction of the Middle East. The day before the Czech president's arrival at NATO headquarters some people there were already talking about the virtual entry to the Atlantic bloc of both that country and several other states in eastern Europe. Admittedly, President Havel himself and NATO Secretary General Woerner found it necessary to refute such rumors, emphasizing that they were opposed to any attempts to isolate the Soviet Union, move the iron curtain toward its borders, and injure its security interests.

Be that as it may, a discussion on all these matters is going on. The only important thing, in my view, is that it should lead not to a new confrontation between some European states and others, but to the arrangement of truly European cooperation, including the problems of security.

Gulf War Seen as Weapons 'Testing Ground'

PM2603135391 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 21 Mar 91 First Edition p 5

[Article by Colonel Dmitriy Belskiy under "Observer's Opinion": "Weapons Trial on 'Live Testing Ground'"]

[Text] The war in the Persian Gulf has ended. As expected, Iraq has suffered defeat. The aggressor who encroached on Kuwait's sovereignty has been punished. Undoubtedly, from this point of view the war was a just one.

However, behind its outward respectability the war in the Persian Gulf has another face. It would seem, the just war, whose proclaimed aim was the punishment of the aggressor, had other aims, alas, not among the most noble. U.S. presidential National Security Adviser Scowcroft acknowledges that U.S. troops carried out a trial run of weapons on the "live testing ground," proving American technology created in the United States for another war, in Europe.

This policy reflects the well-known American pragmatism from many angles—in this case, military pragmatism. Once again it was confirmed that America does not change. The Pentagon remains the Pentagon. The military-industrial complex exploited all opportunities to test the effectiveness of the various types of weaponry and technology created over years, over decades, and to study them in a real combat situation.

Here a question arises: Is this not the reason why, during the deployment of the anti-Iraq coalition and afterward, during the combat operations, the United States skillfully maneuvered the Iraqi leadership into an "offside" position, and the international community then found itself presented with the fait accompli of the need to enforce military solutions?

It is possible that for Americans this war will go down in the history of the art of warfare as a textbook example of a war that is almost bloodless for the victor, won essentially thanks to the huge U.S. military superiority. But we know that in the end it was a veritable massacre, and not a clash of equals. The U.S. losses were somewhere around 100. Iraq's losses are estimated as 150,000, and that is just among servicemen. How many of the civilian population were killed? In the opinion of

the International Red Cross, "the entire horror of the Iraqi population's sufferings will emerge when military censorship is lifted."

When you examine the day-by-day course of the recent combat operations, you form the impression that the Persian Gulf really was turned into an unprecedented testing ground for qualitatively new arms and combat technology, for the most sophisticated and destructive kinds of weaponry. The consequences of mass destruction were given a workout. In this the war showed its dangerous and unpleasant character.

Directly after the invasion of Kuwait by Iraqi forces and the occupation of that country, the U.S Defense Department considerably stepped up the development of sophisticated new types of weapons and the process of equipping U.S. forces with them. THE WASHINGTON POST noted that these steps were taken with the aim of "capitalizing on the U.S. technological superiority over Iraq and providing U.S. troops with a more deadly weapons arsenal."

What then are the main elements in the U.S. offensive capacity? There are the new hyperaccurate systems produced on an active basis in the United States since the seventies and termed "smart weapons." The principle of "one shot (launch)—one hit" enshrined in these weapons ensured one of their most important characteristics—their high level of strike accuracy.

The "smart weapons" of various types—from cruise missiles to antitank missiles—and their accuracy of delivery to the target were tested, so to say, on "live targets." In particular, the sea-launched "Tomahawk" cruise missiles were employed for the first time in combat conditions. In the early days of the military operations they were used mainly to inflict strikes on Iraq's important strategic objectives, primarily military installations producing chemical weapons. Naturally exploiting the favorable public opinion arising in the United States after their successful use in combat conditions against Iraq, while the war was still in progress the Pentagon urgently placed a new order for a consignment of 400 cruise missiles. The order went to General Dynamics and McDonnell-Douglas and under the terms of their contract, will deliver the new missiles by March 1993.

The war, as can be seen, has stimulated the creative activity of generals, arms designers, and companies producing arms. Many weapons in effect passed during the war the concluding stage of tests before their adoption. For example the SLAM, the guided "air-to-surface" missile delivered by television homing head. It was put into series production no earlier than the end of last year. With this missile strikes were inflicted on Iraq's military and economic potential from carrier-based aircraft.

The "Patriot" missile complex taken on board in 1982 was employed in combat conditions for the first time during the war in the Persian Gulf. It repulsed the attacks by the Iraqi "al-Husayn" ballistic missiles on Israeli and Saudi Arabian territory efficiently enough. This has given a fresh impetus to the Strategic Defense Initiative program, that had begun to wither on the vine. At any rate, Washington has adopted the decision to increase grants toward the further realization of this program by $1.7 billion, part of it will go to the Raytheon military-industrial corporation.

Obviously for the same reason the Grumman Aerospace corporation hastened to offer the Pentagon for operations in the Persian Gulf two of the newest E-8 [as published] all-weather spy planes, based on the Boeing 707, even before the completion of the development program. They are fitted with radar systems that even in bad weather can "peer" over the front line to a distance of 100 km. The E-8 planes coordinated target designation with the well-known AWACS system, also used for the first time in combat operations. The latter enabled combat objectives—for example a concentration of Iraqi manpower and equipment at a distance of up to 500 km—to be targeted accurately.

To strike at Iraqi troop positions from the air new-generation aerial bombs were used. In particular, there were "surprise packages" for both infantry and for combat equipment—bombs and mines scattered in cassettes from containers in huge quantities over a large area.

Or, for example, the aerial bombs armed with a highly inflammable liquid that disperses in the air while the bomb is falling and ignites when it explodes. A rarefied sphere is formed in the explosion zone as a result of the burnup of oxygen, and anyone located within this sphere, whether on the surface or in dugouts, is doomed to die from asphyxiation. Experts in international law class these types of bombs as barbaric.

Other members of the alliance also rushed to test their innovations. For example, British troops used Lynx helicopters designed to combat tanks in night conditions. To this end they were fitted with television instruments and target illuminators planned for introduction only in 1991. The Gazelle helicopter laser system was also utilized and a new radar system was tested...

However, the war in the Persian Gulf has another, no less tragic and venomous aspect. Saddam Husayn scorned the multinational forces' technological superiority and the deadly aircraft and cruise missile strikes and deliberately set against them a readiness to make any sacrifices and to use mass destruction weapons. He was ready to unleash terrible retribution against the anti-Iraqi coalition, including the use of mass destruction weapons. He actually resorted to the inhuman practice of seizing hostages for use as a human shield. At the same time the Iraqi population and the Iraqi Army also became hostages to his adventurism. They were knowingly condemned by Saddam Husayn to be the sacrifices he accepted with such stoical calm.

Foreign Banks Form Association in Moscow

PM2503130991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Mar 91 Union Edition p 4

[Report by M. Berger: "Foreign Bankers in USSR, Unite!"]

[Text] A meeting has taken place in Moscow of representatives of foreign banks accredited to Moscow and it was decided to create a Bankers Club.

Representatives of 25 Western banks with offices in the Soviet Union gathered to create their own "informal" organization. M. Frants [name as transliterated], one of the initiators of the meeting and head of the Austrian "Lenderbank" mission, that has long been working productively on the Soviet market, hopes that with time the club will be joined by many other Western banks represented in the Soviet Union. At least, not one of the nearly 60 banks recieving invitations has refused.

The first thing that comes to mind (by analogy with our own associations and unions) is that they have joined together to struggle together against Soviet bureaucracy. Doctor Frants, the most likely candidate for the post of president of the Bankers Club, categorically denies this suggestion. On the contrary, he said, we believe that the club will help the consolidation of cooperation and understanding both in our mutual relations with official structures and with similar associations of Soviet commercial banks. Here each of the banks joining our club remains itself and pursues its own independent commercial policy. The main reason why we decided to unite is the emergence of what is a new situation for us. In December last year banking legislation was adopted. Laws on taxation and currency regulation were adopted. That is, "the rules of the game" appeared. We shall not discuss their content right now, thank god, as they say, that these rules have emerged. They change our role here and our opportunities.

It is hard to say whether a club of foreign bankers will be able to properly fulfill these generally simple functions and whether that will be its sole activity. But it is entirely likely that this not entirely conventional association will also help our consideration of the market economy and will promote mutual understanding in the complex sphere that is the credit market.

Northeast Asia

Japan's Ozawa Continues Visit to Moscow

Meets With Gorbachev 26 Mar

LD2603171591 Moscow TASS in English 1643 GMT 26 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 26 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev and Ichiro Ozawa, general secretary of the Japanese Liberal Democratic Party, met eye-to-eye today to continue discussing issues connected with the Soviet president's forthcoming visit to Japan.

Both of them summed up their discussions these days as a useful and important contribution to preparing Soviet-Japanese summit talks.

Discusses Territorial Concerns

OW2603170891 Tokyo KYODO in English 1648 GMT 26 Mar 91

[By Antonia Kamiya]

[Text] Moscow, March 26 KYODO—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev on Tuesday reiterated his desire to discuss "earnestly and sincerely" the northern territories issue when he visits Japan next month.

Ichiro Ozawa, secretary general of the ruling Liberal Democratic Party, said Gorbachev promised to discuss with Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu the dispute over four islands held by the Soviets when he visits Japan April 16-19.

Gorbachev agreed in the 45-minute meeting with the influential Japanese politician that the two countries "should remove the political obstacle" as soon as possible and establish a "new relationship."

Ozawa urged the Soviet leader to recognize Japanese sovereignty over the four islands—Iturup, Kunashir, Shikotan and the Habomais—which were seized by the Soviets after World War II.

Although no concrete agreements were reached in the second meeting in as many days between the two, Ozawa quoted Gorbachev as saying that the talks themselves were a sign of progress.

Ozawa said he hopes the two rounds of talks with Gorbachev would provide the "link" needed to resolve the territorial dispute and the conclusion of a bilateral peace treaty.

Soviet Vice President Gennadiy Yanayev, who met with Ozawa later, said it was the first high-level recognition by both countries of a pending issue, an apparent reference to the territorial dispute.

Yanayev told Ozawa that President Gorbachev is "in the midst of making a major decision."

Ozawa told reporters he made "concrete proposals" on the territorial issue in his second meeting with Gorbachev but refused to divulge the contents.

He said he and Gorbachev did not discuss economic cooperation.

Meets With Ivashko

LD2603174791 Moscow TASS in English 1734 GMT 26 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 26 TASS—Vladimir Ivashko, deputy leader of the Soviet Communist Party, met today with Ichiro Ozawa, secretary-general of Japan's Liberal Democratic Party.

During the friendly discussion Ivashko briefed Ozawa on the situation in the country and the party. He described the latter's strategic policy of achieving through and irreversible reform in every aspect of public life amid greater democracy, fundamentally improving international relations, and decisively affirming the inviolable principles of non-violence, peaceful cooperation, equal security and free choice for all countries, big and small, on the world scene.

Ivashko stressed that shedding ideological stereotypes increases the Communist Party's possibilities to develop relations and cooperation with various foreign parties.

Ozawa said that the clear confirmation of the Soviet Communist Party's perestroyka policies and the convincing demonstration that claims of those policies being reversed are groundless are highly important to the Japanese side, which is wholly supportive of the Soviet leadership's reformist line.

Ivashko and Ozawa also discussed Soviet-Japanese relations.

They called for continuing to develop relations between their parties.

Valentin Falin, Karen Brutenz, H. Kumagai, Sumio Edamura and K. Togo also took part in the discussion.

Japanese Premier Praises Talks

LD2703081491 Moscow TASS in English 0704 GMT 27 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Kopnov]

[Text] Tokyo March 27 TASS—Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu praised the results of Tuesday's second meeting between President Mikhail Gorbachev and Japan's Ruling Liberal Democratic Party Secretary-General Ichiro Ozawa.

Speaking in legislature today, Kaifu said the meeting set favourable conditions for this week's talks between the Soviet and Japanese foreign ministers and Gorbachev's subsequent visit to Japan.

In turn, Japan's Cabinet Secretary-General Misoji Sakamoto told a morning news conference that "on the whole, progress was made" at the second meeting between Gorbachev and Ozawa.

Considering that both sides achieved a consensus on the need to expand Japanese-Soviet relations, Ozawa's visit to Moscow was successful, he said.

Japanese Envoy Prepares for Gorbachev's Apr Visit

Meets Frolov

PM2203160991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Mar 91 Second Edition p 4

[Unattributed report: "Meeting at the Editorial Office"]

[Text] I.T. Frolov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chief editor of PRAVDA, received S. Edamura, Japanese ambassador to the USSR, at his request 20 March. The discussion covered issues related to the USSR president's forthcoming visit to Japan in mid-April, Soviet-Japanese relations, and the mass media's role in their coverage.

Sees Ivashko

LD2203203891 Moscow TASS International Service in English 1549 GMT 22 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow, 22 Mar (TASS)—Vladimir Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received Sumio Edamura, the Japanese ambassador to the USSR. Some issues of internal and international policies of the CPSU and of Soviet-Japanese relations, in light of the forthcoming visit of USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev to Japan, were discussed.

Gorbachev's Writings Published in Japan

LD2703113891 Moscow TASS in English 1056 GMT 27 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Kuchko]

[Text] Tokyo March 27 TASS—The Tokyo-based Kokusai Bunka Shippansha publishers has issued selected articles and speeches by Mikhail Gorbachev in preparation for the Soviet president's visit to Japan.

The collection includes excerpts from works of the Soviet leader dated from the beginning of 1985. They are devoted to perestroyka, the theory of socialism, soviet-Japanese relations. His pronouncements are related to the problem of consolidating peace and security, in the Asian-Pacific region, as well as Soviet-American relations.

The book begins with the address of the Soviet president in which he expresses hope that his speeches will help Japanese readers to grasp the events taking place in the Soviet Union. "It is very important that we be understood, that our real intentions, our possibilities and difficulties be realised. We also wish our readers to see what is the basis for our hope for the success of perestroyka," Gorbachev writes.

"It is particularly important that our neighbours understand this. We wish to be good neighbours of Japan. I hope that my visit to Japan will help achieve this purpose, which is of historic importance for both our countries."

Near East & South Asia

Executions Follow Attempt on Saddam's Life

LD2503175491 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 25 Mar 91

[Text] As many as 27 high-ranking officers of the Republican Guard are said to have been executed for an attempt to assassinate President Saddam Husayn.

This follows a report by the Egyptian-based (?AL AHRAR) which said, referring to Iranian sources, the execution was carried out in Baghdad overnight on 9 March. No details of the assassination attempt was given.

The Iranian sources are believed to have the full list of the officers shot by a firing squad.

Envoy to Afghanistan Praises Ties, Promises Aid

LD2603212191 Kabul Domestic Service in Pashto 1530 GMT 26 Mar 91

[Excerpts] At a news conference held this morning in the Soviet science and culture building, Soviet Ambassador Boris Nikolayevich Pastukhov explained the USSR Supreme Soviet referendum and its results. He also commented on the fraternal friendship, good neighborliness, economic, technical, and cultural cooperation between the Soviet Union and the Republic of Afghanistan. [passage omitted]

Regarding Afghan-Soviet relations he said: I must point out with satisfaction that Soviet-Afghan relations are fraternal and good-neighborly, although in the history of these relations there are difficult periods. These relations have never lost their dynamism and they will develop and progress in the future, too.

With full responsibility I would like to point out that the Soviet Union, despite all its economic difficulties, has not and will not reduce its assistance to Afghanistan. The enemies of Afghanistan uselessly rely on a reduction of this assistance. Soviet assistance in the current year, no less than the previous year, will be extended. For example, wheat, petroleum, kerosene, diesel, and other goods as assistance will be handed over to the Republic of Afghanistan.

I am sure that the noise of the Soviet transport planes which land every day at Kabul Airport loaded with

goods, proves this claim of ours. Commercial and economic cooperation in the current year indicates its subsequent growth. [sentence as heard] The volume of the exchange of commercial goods in the current year will exceed 500 million rubles.

Relations between the representatives of Afghanistan's private sector with Soviet enterprises have noticeably become more active. The economic reforms which are underway in the Soviet Union, as well as variety in the economy of our country, provide feasible conditions for the realization of this process. [passage omitted]

East Europe

Troop Withdrawal Talks With Poland Viewed

91UM0497A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Mar 91 First Edition p 3

[Article by Lieutenant Colonel V. Nikanorov: "Problems Remain"]

[Text] **The fifth round of Soviet-Polish negotiations on conditions for the stay and withdrawal of Soviet troops from the Polish Republic, and also the transit of the Western Group of Forces through Polish territory, has ended in Moscow.**

These negotiations, in which the representatives of the concerned departments of both countries are taking part, have been taking place since November of last year in the Polish and Soviet capitals alternately. The last four rounds did not bring appreciable successes. The Polish side put forth very strict requirements on the dates of the withdrawal of the Northern Group of forces—by the end of this year, which is unacceptable to the Soviet side. In our opinion the payment asked for the transit on Polish railroads and highways of operational equipment and troops being withdrawn from Germany is excessively high.

How did the fifth round of negotiations, which lasted two days, end? In the opinion of its participants it achieved definite progress, principally on questions concerning problems not related to the withdrawal of the Northern Group of Forces. The problem concerns transit. Quite a few lances were broken in previous rounds over this question. Speaking frankly, the position of the Polish side which, it would seem, did everything to prevent transit, was not entirely clear. This is even stranger if you consider that Polish railroads, as reported in the press, are loaded now to only 40 percent of capacity. Our freight, going from Germany, could provide many in Poland with work, which is a pressing problem now in the face of increasing unemployment in the country. Nonetheless, conditions that are multiplying like mushrooms after a rain, which are actually hindering transit, automatically prompts the thought: But perhaps we should abandon transit through Polish territory entirely? Perhaps there is an argument for organizing shipments through other countries or by sea? Especially since there are calculations that indicate that this could prove to be more economically advantageous for us.

Nevertheless, the sides have come to an agreement in the meantime that there will be no motor vehicle transit through Polish territory—only rail and air. Resolutions have yet to be found on other problems discussed in the negotiations.

"This was a working round," remarked V. Kopteltsev, head of the Soviet delegation. "It must be said that the recent negotiations in Warsaw held by General of the Army M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, and Polish leaders helped to move certain important questions forward. Now the sides have already been able to shift to consideration of the details. It is natural that in the process a whole series of new contradictions arise which were not considered earlier. But they, as the saying goes, are of a different scale and another order by comparison with those difficulties that were encountered earlier; that is, they are quite surmountable. General of the Army Moiseyev unequivocally declared in Warsaw that the withdrawal of troops from Polish territory will start within the next few days. The Polish side has become convinced that we are not simply holding on to Polish land, as the saying goes, "out of principle," and that we firmly intend to withdraw our troops. General of the Army Moiseyev explained clearly that our new defensive concept is based on the fact that it is necessary to defend oneself on one's own territory, relying on one's own people, and not try to defend and protect foreign borders if this is not requested by a given country. I think that the Polish side understood this to be our position. If there were any moments of distrust relative to the intentions of the Soviet Union regarding the fate of the Northern Group of Forces, I think they have now been eliminated.

Thus the fifth round is over. It became a step forward, even though a small one. The laborious work on resolving an intricate complex of problems is continuing.

Polish Company To Assist in Troops' Resettlement

PM2603110391 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 23 Mar 91 First Edition p 5

[S. Petukhov report: "'Marko' Offers"]

[Text] One of the main aims of the activity of the Polish state firm "Marko" is to preserve and develop mutually beneficial trade and economic cooperation with the Soviet Union. A commercial exhibition of its output—"Cooperation-91" has opened in Moscow. The exhibition presents examples of clothing, furniture, cosmetics, and domestic electrical goods which "Marko" is offering Soviet consumers.

"Marko" has been cooperating with Soviet foreign trade organizations and firms for over 30 years. One of its main trade partners during all these years was the Northern Group of Soviet Forces which were stationed

on Polish territory. "Marko" provides Soviet military installations with electric power and fuel, and their inhabitants with basic necessities. In connection with the imminent withdrawal of Soviet forces from Poland the firm intends to assist in the organization of this complex operation with as few losses as possible for the Soviet side. In particular, it will take on itself some of the cost involved in settling the Soviet servicemen who are leaving Poland.

"Regardless of the fact that reciprocal accounts between our countries are being settled on the basis of world prices, which naturally causes certain difficulties, we do not want economic ties between the USSR and Poland to be broken," Wislaw Krolikowski, general director of "Marko," said. "Therefore we intend to extend all kinds of direct contacts not just with state foreign trade organizations but also with USSR enterprises and cooperatives," he stated.

Gorbachev Meets Visiting Polish Political Figure

LD2503205891 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 25 Mar 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] There was a brief friendly meeting in the central committee of the CPSU today between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Mieczyslaw Rakowski, the prominent Polish political and public figure, who is in the Soviet Union at the invitation of scientific institutions of the CPSU.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev expressed his conviction that, on the basis of their good traditions, the Soviet Union and Poland will make every effort for the further development of cooperation based on the principles of neighborliness, respect for freedom and choice, and mutual advantage.

Reports Note Walesa's Visit to Washington

Expectations on Debt Noted

PM2203140191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Mar 91 Union Edition p 5

[Report by correspondent V. Nadein: "Poland's Debts Written Off; but Main Aim of L. Walesa's U.S. Visit Is Elsewhere"]

[Text] Washington—"We want your transition (to a new society) to be crowned by success and your new democracy to flourish," said President G. Bush before announcing to Lech Walesa that 70 percent of Polish debts to the United States were written off.

The recently elected Polish president made his first state visit to Washington since it is here that the main problem of that East European country—money—is resolved.

The news was both gratifying and distressing. Gratifying because the United States, which in principle has a very negative attitude toward the phenomenon that is the unilateral writing off of debts for anyone on any pretext, has on this occasion waived its principles. Therefore a major concession like the White House's agreement to forget and never again mention $2.7 billion could not fail to gratify Walesa.

But before the trip, while he was still in Warsaw, the president said he would insist on 80 percent, and Robert Barry, assistant deputy U.S. secretary of state, publicly even promised a full, 100 percent remission. There were indications in the U.S. press that the chances of this were high.

The United States is not one of the leading creditors of Poland, whose total debts to foreign governments are $33 billion. But what happened in Washington will without doubt seriously affect the so-called "Paris Club," an unofficial group which coordinates the actions of Germany, Japan, France, and Canada, which hold the bulk of Warsaw's debts. These countries have already announced their intention to follow the example of the White House and a figure in the order of 50 percent is cited for the writing off of debts.

If that happens Poland, from being a country obliged to spend virtually all its income from exports on paying loan interest, will move to the ranks of the countries whose ability to pay is not in doubt. There is no doubt that this will promote the success of the transitional period, which the West frankly calls a process which accords with its interests.

But the United States considers the nature of the economic reforms in Poland to be an even more serious argument in favor of writing off the debts. The resolve and consistency with which Poland is renouncing the edict-based economy accords with Western ideas.

In his public statements, which began in the very first hours of the visit and will continue throughout his eight-day stay in the United States, Lech Walesa stressed and will of course further develop his loyalty to Poland's return to the world economic system. "Great opportunities for business are opening up in our country," he said. "For America this will also be big business. We are also in need of America's participation."

The Polish president is perfectly obviously aware that the likelihood of big loans of the old type—from state to state—is extremely low. That is why his main hope is private business. The enlistment of private U.S. capital is virtually the main aim of this trip, three quarters of which is devoted to nongovernment contacts.

During his meeting with L. Walesa in the White House G. Bush announced his intention to suggest to the U.S. Congress that it increase financial aid to the East European countries by $470 million. Of course, this money will not come at once. First there will be stormy debates, calculations "for" and "against," and Senate hearings....

Yet it is a question of a sum approximately equal to the annual expenditure of a firm like "Ford," but not on its entire production, merely on advertizing. It is hardly worth emphasizing the extent to which this whole donation falls short of the most minimal requirements of any East European country.

One more important component of this visit by L. Walesa is the improvement of relations with American Jews. The old trail of accusations of anti-Semitism lies behind Poland as a whole and Walesa himself in particular. In contrast to economic problems, which can easily be ascribed to the previous regime, these accusations have been nurtured by facts and rumors of more recent times....

The Polish president intends to resolutely destroy this image. He will visit the monument under construction to the victims of Nazi genocide and will meet with activists of U.S. Jewish organizations. It is believed that Walesa has brought with him valuable materials, as yet unknown to the world, about the Warsaw ghetto and the heroes of the antifascist uprising there.

The transfer to Warsaw of the ashes of Jan Paderewski, the great Polish musician who was that country's prime minister and died in the United States during World War II, should also be a symbol of the new relations between the United States and Poland.

This ceremony is scheduled for 29 June this year, the 50th anniversary of J. Paderewski's death. The largest community of American Poles, from Chicago—a city which will be the last stop during Walesa's visit—will take an active part in the ceremony.

Results Eyed

PM2703102591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Mar 91 Second Edition p 5

[Article by Mikhail Tretyakov "Viewpoint": "Walesa in America"]

[Text] One of the first foreign visits made by Lech Walesa, the new Polish president, was to the United States. There is nothing surprising in that. Washington occupies a key position in the international economic and currency system. For its part, the present Polish leadership is encountering serious difficulties in implementing radical economic reform. There has been a more than 30-percent decline in production in the country and the population's standard of living is falling, which is causing working people to protest, plus a huge foreign debt of close to $50 billion.

At least some positive results which would help strengthen presidential power in Warsaw are essential in this situation. Walesa went to Washington, where, judging by international mass media reaction, he has been given a suitable welcome. He has held meetings and conversations with U.S. President George Bush and representatives of American political and business circles. There are already certain results: The United States has decided to write off 70 percent of the Polish debt to the American administration. That means Warsaw's debt to Washington will be cut from $3.8 billion to $1.14 billion.

As George Bush stated at a White House meeting with the Polish president: "We want your economic transformations to succeed and your new democracy to flourish." He also reported that he had asked Congress to increase nonrepayable aid to Poland and other East European countries to $470 million next year.

What, then, are the reasons for such a move by the American administration? Clearly it wanted to suggest that, although Poland is overcoming a dangerous period in the development of its economy, great difficulties lie in store for it in the future. On the other hand, Walesa needed to return to Poland with some concrete result which would help him secure the population's support for further reforms which, according to specialists, will have a painful effect upon the situation of Polish families.

In the opinion of TRYBUNA, the Social Democracy of the Polish Republic newspaper, Washington's decision to cut Poland's debt to the United States by 70 percent is not so much economic as political in nature. It confirms that the White House has developed misgivings about the ability of Poland and the other countries of East Europe to make the transition to a market economy without conflict.

Walesa's statements about Soviet-Polish relations during his visit to the United States are not, I think, without interest to us neighbors of Poland. The Polish president spoke, in particular, about M.S. Gorbachev as a man and politician, stating that he needs to be helped in the present difficult situation. Assessing the centrifugal forces in the USSR, Walesa observed that not a single republic was capable of autonomous existence and that sooner or later this will be grasped by their peoples and leaders.

Troop Withdrawal From CSFR Ahead of Schedule

LD2603135291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0918 GMT 26 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Igor Shamshin]

[Excerpts] Prague, 26 Mar (TASS)—The withdrawal of Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia will be completed by 20 May 1991, which is a month and a half prior to the agreed time—30 June 1991. [passage omitted]

Col.-Gen. E.A. Vorobyev told Czech legislators that all types of ammunition, including nuclear, have been transported out of the Central Group of Forces depots. In connection with this, he confirmed that "Soviet troops never had and do not have chemical weapons here." Representatives of Soviet and Czech military

command assured deputies of the legislature that all issues of ownership and finances linked to the handover of depots will be resolved without delay.

Yugoslav Army's Pledge May Deter SFRY Unrest

PM2603130191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Mar 91 Union Edition p 4

[Report by Ye. Vostrukhov and N. Yermolovich: "Army Will Not Allow the SFRY to Collapse"]

[Excerpt] Belgrade—[passage omitted] For the first time in its postwar history the SFRY has to all intents and purposes been left for several days without a leader of its presidency. What is more, the blockade declared by Serbia and Montenegro (the latter's representative also ostentatiously abandoned his work at the country's supreme state organ in solidarity with Jovic) threatens to paralyzed the presidency's activity once and for all. Many observers (mainly in the West) have hastened to talk about the collapse of the Yugoslav federation, the supposed downfall of the SFRY, and the inevitability of civil war and a military coup....

At this truly critical moment for the SFRY the statement issued by the Yugoslav People's Army leadership has cooled passions down. Its supreme command staff stated firmly that the Army has no intention in the future of interfering in the country's political life. At the same time, it gave a frank warning that, in accordance with its commitments, the Army will not allow an arbitrary change in SFRY state borders, will ensure the safety of citizens of any nationality, and will defend the state constitution. The statement issued by the Army leadership undoubtedly had a decisive effect on the further course of political events. There very soon came an announcement that there would be a routine sitting of the SFRY Presidency. But everyone was worried by the question: Will any good come of it—without a chairman and in the absence of representatives from Serbia, Montenegro, Vojvodina, and Kosovo?

The multiparty Serbian parliament once again demonstrated its ability to adopt well-considered constructive decisions under complex conditions. It took nine hours to analyze the sociopolitical situation in Serbia and Yugoslavia and the role played by top institutions of power in overcoming the crisis and stabilizing society. Deputies understood the reasons prompting B. Jovic to take the extreme means of protest. Nevertheless the overwhelming majority of the 58 deputies who spoke believe that blocking the supreme state organs of power will not benefit Serbia or Yugoslavia. In the voting only 17 deputies backed B. Jovic's resignation and there were four abstentions. [passage omitted]

Pact Military Representatives Hold Final Talks

LD2503140291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1245 GMT 25 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow, 25 Mar (TASS)—The foreign heads of the Warsaw Pact military structures gathered for the last time in the office of Army General Vladimir Lobov, chief of staff of the Joint Military Forces, in Moscow today.

As is known, all the military structures of this bloc are to be disbanded by 31 March on the decision of the Extraordinary Political Consultative Committee adopted in Budapest (1991).

This was the last meeting of the former allies. The former representatives of the Warsaw Pact military command will start leaving for home in the next two to three days.

Supreme Soviet

Resolution on Suspending Coal Strikes

PM2703103991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Mar 91 Second Edition p 2

[USSR Supreme Soviet resolution "On Suspending Strikes at the Country's Coal Industry Enterprises"]

[Text] Considering the emergency situation in the national economy that has taken shape as a result of the strikes at coal industry enterprises and with a view to preventing irreparable damage to the country's economy and the possible disruption of the most important social programs, the USSR Supreme Soviet decrees:

1. That the USSR Cabinet of Ministers in conjunction with the republics' governments be instructed to begin immediately an examination of the package of economic and social demands of the regional workers committees of the coal basins and that with the participation of representatives of the mine collectives and miners' trade unions they elaborate coordinated measures for the improvement of the miners' work and material situation and the sector's normal development.

The USSR Supreme Soviet must be informed of the fulfillment of this instruction no later than 30 April 1991.

2. That in the interests of stabilizing the situation in the country and in accordance with article nine of the USSR Law "On the Procedure for Resolving Collective Labor Disputes (Conflicts)" strikes at coal industry enterprises must be suspended for a period of two months from the time of the adoption of this resolution.

3. That it be recommended to the labor collectives and trade union and workers committees of the base sectors of the national economy that they refrain from going on strike until the end of 1991 and that for the protection of working people's rights broader use be made of conciliation commissions, labor arbitration, and collective contracts and agreements between the enterprise administration (department) and the labor collective.

4. That the monitoring of the implementation of this resolution be assigned to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the USSR Supreme Court of Arbitration, and the USSR Prosecutor's Office.

[Signed] A. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Moscow, Kremlin, 26 March 1991.

Implementation Required

LD2603152991 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1400 GMT 26 Mar 91

[Report by correspondent Lyudmila Semina at the USSR Supreme Soviet session]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] The main part of today's parliamentary sitting was devoted by the deputies to the draft resolution on suspension of strikes at the country's coal industry enterprises. The resolution says, among other things: to instruct the USSR Cabinet of Ministers to begin, without delay, discussion of the package of economic and social demands of regional workers' committees of the coal fields. To work out, jointly with the representatives of the miners' collectives and miners' trade unions, a set of agreed measures for improving the working conditions and material situation of the miners as well as for normal development of the industry.

Further, point two: In the interests of stabilization of the situation in the country, according to Article 9 of the USSR law on procedure for settlement of collective labor disputes and conflicts, to suspend strikes at the coal industry enterprises for two months starting from the moment of passing of the resolution. [passage omitted]

Minister of Justice Lushchikov took the floor to give information on further proposals by the USSR Cabinet of Ministers concerning this issue. The minister said that a mechanism is needed for the implementation of this resolution. The mechanism should envisage strict measures.

Penalties Rejected

LD2603181691 Moscow TASS in English 1743 GMT 26 Mar 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow March 26 TASS—The Soviet parliament today adopted a resolution, suspending strikes in the country's mining industry for two months.

The resolution, adopted in accordance with the Soviet law on the procedure for settling labour disputes, comes into force today and aims to preclude further damage to the national economy.

Miners' strike that began on March 1 has involved a quarter of 600 mines in the country's major coalfields.

In addition to economic demands, miners pursue political goals, including the resignation of the Soviet president and the central government, the dissolution of the Congress of the People's Deputies and the national parliament.

According to the resolution, the Soviet Cabinet of Ministers and republics' governments must "immediately begin to consider a package of economic and social demands of regional workers' committees of coalfields and, with the participation of representatives of miners' collectives and their trade unions, work out concerted measures to improve miners' labour and material conditions and facilitate a normal development of the industry".

The parliament also recommended that working collectives, trade unions and workers' committees of the country's basic industries refrain from strikes till the end of the year.

The majority of deputies supported the resolution, while others pointed to the inadmissibility of the use of force against miners.

Deputies voted down proposals of the Cabinet of Ministers, under which ordinary miners who continue the strike would be laid off without the consent of the trade union while strike organisers would face criminal charges (two years of corrective labour).

Those proposals were nonetheless sent to parliamentary committees. Later, they may be adopted as amendments to the law on the procedure for staging strikes.

Deputies Stress Need for Mediation

LD2603210191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1130 GMT 26 Mar 91

[Interview with USSR Supreme Soviet Deputies Vladimir Ivanovich Samarin and Viktor Yakovlevich Medikov by correspondent Semina at the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin on 26 March—recorded]

[Text] [Semina] The deputies return to discussing the issue of miners' strikes, in a difficult atmosphere, for the third time in the last few days. Vladimir Ivanovich Samarin, author of the draft decision for suspending the strikes at enterprises of the coal industry of the country, and Viktor Yakovlevich Medikov, a deputy from the Kuzbass, are at the microphone with me. Please, could you tell us for what you are working?

[Samarin] I think that the main task for the deputies of the country today—and not only for the deputies of the country but also, maybe, for all of the active civil population—is the possibility to achieve a serious dialogue between the working people and the government. In such a situation, I think adopting the decision on suspending the miners' strikes should not be considered as a sort of punitive or punishment function on the behalf of the Supreme Soviet. This actually gives them the chance for a cooling down period, a chance for, precisely, the brains to cool down.

[Semina] Even through the deputies did not actually vote for precisely such a wording: a cooling-down period.

[Samarin] Yes, generally speaking, in principle, it constructively is present but not literally. I think the inclusion as the first paragraph of this decision of the instruction to the Cabinet of Ministers to start immediately looking into the demands of the miners is precisely a very important thing. This is, precisely, what the miners' collectives were not able to achieve for a long time, to force Comrade Pavlov to sit down at the negotiations table. Now, the Supreme Soviet instructs Comrade Pavlov to take up the investigation and the examination, the immediate investigation, of the miners demands. This is very important.

But, it is clear that this cannot take place in the explosive situation, which is why the second paragraph is the suspension of the strike. I would like to stress, not the halt of the strike without any punitive sanctions, without threats, without ultimatums issued to the people and the working people because you understand that, you understand yourself it simply impossible to take up an ultimatum attitude here.

[Semina] Viktor Yakovlevich, you took a very active part in the discussion, and you will meet directly with your voters, including miners. What is your position in this?

[Medikov] Unfortunately, the situation has been very much neglected. This decision was needed at the end of February, and even better in January, when the first signal of this strike came in 18 January, and it was then postponed to this time. We should now act, having in mind what the situation is at this moment. I think that the forces are relatively equal. The miners have the economic levers in their hands. The authorities here have other levers. There must be a dialogue; there is no other way out.

Coerscion methods will come to nothing. History shows that nowhere were the miners defeated in the end. That is, dialogue is needed, but unfortunately, there has been no dialogue. I consider that the government is to blame for this when it has dragged on a decision for a whole month. The president is to blame for this, and the supreme soviet is to be blamed for this. By the way, it is also the fault of the mass media. Only a week ago, at last, it started to give some information. There was no information at all before that.

Others visited and I visited Kuzbass. The picture that was created by the mass media was that the everything was calm there and that there are no upheavals in the country.

But, in my opinion, the situation is most complex with the wave of strikes. If it combines with the wave of price rises, it is most possible that the Lithuanian version may occur. It already happened in January this year. I hope this does not happen now.

In no case, should there be any punitive measures.

We shall continue the discussion on these issues today, in the afternoon.

[Semina] You have adopted the draft as a whole, and the question is of adopting separate paragraphs. Certainly, a dialogue is important, and some deputies proposed an additional measure that has not, at this moment, been included in the draft of the decision: to send deputy groups for talks. They have, some how, learned to conduct talks. The situation in the country is complex. What do you think of this?

[Medikov] You know, I think that such groups undoubtedly will be of help precisely under the conditions of the cooling down period, but this should take place, by all means, as a supplement to the work of the government. That is, if the deputies are only going to travel to talk to people and talk people into something, then the issues will not move from a standstill. We are placing an obligation on the government and the (?department) of deputies, of course, to help in developing this dialogue, to do their business and help to solve the problems.

[Semina] Thank you for explaining things to our listeners. The deputies will continue the discussion of the draft law after the break, but, on the whole, as it regards the main paragraphs it has already adopted.

Bessmertnykh Briefs Gorbachev's Japan Visit

LD2603100591 Moscow TASS in English 0948 GMT 26 Mar 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow March 26 TASS—"Some eleven to 16" agreements are being prepared for President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Japan in April, Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh told the Soviet parliament today.

Bessmertnykh said all the agreements were "of a purely applied character, including economic, scientific and technical agreements".

"So far, our relations have been rather indifferent. Now, we will have a series of international legal acts, determining a more positive character for relations between the two countries," Bessmertnykh said.

French, Italian Treaties Detailed

LD2603104691 Moscow TASS in English 1029 GMT 26 Mar 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow March 26 TASS—The Soviet parliament today ratified the treaty on accord and cooperation between the USSR and France, and the treaty of friendship and cooperation between the USSR and Italy. The treaties were signed in October-November, 1990.

Presenting the documents to members of parliament, Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh emphasised that they are "fully in keeping with Soviet national interests", and that their signing "is a remarkable event in Soviet foreign policy in Europe. It was the first instance of political treaties between countries belonging to opposing military alliances."

The minister emphasised that "a new page in European history is turned by the Soviet Union together with France and Italy".

He also said that bilateral agreements between France and Italy "are important in the present period when a need of bold, imaginative ideas and joint efforts is felt in Europe".

The minister said that the treaties offer a number of advantages for Soviet national interests: "the consolidation of stability in Europe, the decrees of the military component of relations, full involvement of the Soviet economy and its future market in the world economy, the use of French and Italian experience in intensifying to the utmost the perestroyka process in the Soviet economy".

Bessmertnykh said that "in conditions when there exist seats of tension along the perimeter of Europe, a very important role in the structure of stability and bilateral partnership is played by the changes in political geometry in Europe and the Soviet-French and Soviet-Italian treaties".

Dwelling on the military-political content of the two treaties, the minister said that they cannot be classed with pacts or alliances. "They are much rather consultation-based commitments in the event of crisis situations or an aggravation of the situation in Europe. In these circumstances the sides are obliged to act as friendly powers, not as adversaries."

Bessmertnykh added that "in conditions of radical change in Europe and world it is important for the Soviet Union to ensure its interests also through bilateral obligations to prevent the weakening of positive processes and the emergence of new dividing lines in Europe." He said that the treaties "clearly attest to Western partners' intention to consolidate cooperation with the Soviet Union and promote the USSR's political and economic stability".

A total of 372 votes were cast for the ratification of the treaty on accord and cooperation between the Soviet Union and France. There were four votes against and ten abstentions. The treaty of friendship and cooperation between the USSR and Italy was supported by 378 votes. There were four votes against and four abstentions.

Deputies Debate Agricultural Problems

PM2603143591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Mar 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report by parliamentary correspondents A. Stepovoy and S. Chugayev: "About Daily Bread"]

[Excerpts] Opening the morning joint sitting of the fifth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet 25 March, A. Lukyanov, who was in the chair, urged the deputies to respond to the most urgent processes taking place in the country. During its working day the Union Parliament had to discuss questions of the situation in agriculture, the prices reform, and the miners' strike. But despite the swift pace set from the outset, the deputies first congratulated their colleague V. Gnatyuk, secretary of the USSR

Supreme Soviet Committee for the protection of the people's health, on his birthday.

Then USSR Deputy Prime Minister F. Senko addressed the members of parliament to answer deputies' queries about the situation in agriculture. He devoted his speech to an analysis of the state of the agro-industrial complex and preparation for field work. [passage omitted]

After the speaker had answered the questions those taking part in the session turned to the debates which, taking into account the importance of the subject, took place quite keenly.

Deputy A. Vuychitskiy reminded his colleagues of the words uttered last year by N. Ryzhkov about how as a whole about 80 CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolutions have been adopted on the countryside. Not one of them has been fulfilled. That includes last year's resolution about the sale of equipment to country dwellers for the above-plan sale of grain. He suggested taking to task those to blame for the breakdown in deliveries of agricultural equipment. He also requested that as a measure for the social transformation of the countryside, appropriations for housing construction be shifted from the cities to the countryside.

Deputy N. Lemesheva voiced concern over the introduction of the turnover tax stating that it will strike a blow to the economies of the strongest collective and start farms since their material prosperity depends on subsidiary production facilities, and it will therefore be disadvantageous to develop. The deputy urged that the turnover tax for agriculture be repealed and also placed responsibility for the grave situation taking shape in machine building on the miners who, in her opinion, are being used in a struggle they do not need.

Deputies V. Kasyan, E. Gusakov, V. Belov, Yu. Yakubov, A. Nikonov, A. Veprev, and others took part in the discussion of this question.

At the end of the morning sitting a draft resolution was put to the vote. But it was not successfully adopted as a basis.

Political & Social

State of Emergency 'Increasingly Likely'

LD2703130291 Moscow TASS in English 1234 GMT 27 Mar 91

[By TASS analyst Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow March 27 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev, weathering resignation demands from his chief political rival Boris Yeltsin, Soviet democrats and striking miners, is facing a tough new challenge.

On Monday, the coordination council of the Soyuz group of lawmakers, demanded the holding of an emergency congress of Soviet people's deputies, saying Gorbachev should deliver an account.

Soyuz leadership, who have long demanded that Gorbachev take tough measures to preserve the Soviet Union, capitalised on the results of the March 17 referendum to criticise the new draft of the Union treaty.

They have repeatedly said that there is no need for the new Union treaty, calling on Gorbachev to rein in separatist movements in the republics on the basis of the current Soviet Constitution and laws.

The new statement was much sharper and unusually so. The draft Union treaty contradicts the results of the all-Union referendum and the USSR Constitution, the statement said.

Soyuz leaders also said that Gorbachev was not using the sweeping powers granted him by parliament to take the country out of crisis and said that the president should submit a programme at the emergency congress in accordance "with the direction of the country's development chosen by the people at the referendum".

What prompted this Soyuz action?—It looks like the more conservative part of its members believe that Gorbachev is not prepared to take tough actions in response to a "street offensive" launched by the Democratic Russia bloc against the Union leadership.

The entire history of perestroyka shows that Mikhail Gorbachev opposes the use of force and always looks for a compromise.

At the same time, Democratic Russia's demands to topple Gorbachev by crowd pressure leave him with those who are insisting on emergency actions.

These have more than enough arguments. The miners' strike supported by the radicals threatens to ruin the country's economy. The opposition's calls to oust the Union leadership are fraught with bloody street clashes.

In addition, if Yeltsin succeeds in winning the new Russian presidency, this would result in duopoly, which threatens to break the country apart, if not cause civil war.

It is unlikely that supporters of Soyuz's tough line will succeed in convening the congress. Their move is probably just another attempt to pressure Gorbachev to show force in response to the challenge from the right.

Anyway, the latest developments confirm that the Democratic Russia movement's hasty attempt to come to power at any cost makes the imposition of a state of emergency in the Soviet Union increasingly likely.

Yeltsin Adviser Attacks Ban on Demonstrations

AU2603213891 Sofia BTA in English 2021 GMT 26 Mar 91

[Text] Sofia, March 26 (BTA)—In connection with the resolution of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR to ban strikes and for a "moratorium" on mass demonstrations in the Soviet Union, today Mr. Lev Sukhanov accused the centre of discriminating against the Russian Government and the Supreme Soviet of Russia.

On the initiative of Mr. Boris Yeltsin, based on 500 thousand protest telegrams of miners on strike and other Russian citizens, the Moscow City Council decided not to comply with the resolutions of the Supreme Council of the USSR and a group of democratic MP's are preparing an address for repealing the respective decrees which they are going to send to President Mikhail Gorbachev, Mr. Sukhanov, adviser of Mr. Boris Yeltsin, said.

Mr. Sukhanov observed that the bans of the "centre" have not been coordinated with the Russian authorities and said that a mass protest action had been scheduled to take place in Moscow at the end of March. It has been coordinated with the Executive Committee of the Moscow Council.

Nothing has changed. We started the perestroyka blindfolded and we did not know which way to proceed. But today the democratic processes are irreversible and the people has understood who is who, Mr. Sukhanov said in an interview for the Bulgarian Television tonight.

Pavlov Issues Appeal Against Strikes, Riots

LD2603192891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1750 GMT 26 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow, 26 Mar (TASS)—We are transmitting the text of an appeal by USSR Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov to the country's population:

Esteemed fellow citizens and Muscovites!

I have been moved to address you today by the serious and acute nature of the situation that is taking shape in the country.

The processes of renewal have touched on all aspects of life. In six years the foundations of genuinely democratic institutions of people's power have been established. Soviets at all levels are working, the character of executive power is changing, referendums of the whole people are being held on fundamental issues, and new political parties and movements are being formed. The conditions are being created for the all-round opening up of the personality and for asserting human dignity. It is clear that these processes are going to develop further. Essentially they have already become irreversible in character. The guarantee of this is the will of the people and the laws adopted in its name by the people's deputies of the USSR and the Union and autonomous republics.

It is particularly important now to save the democratic system which is being formed and to do everything to ensure that the processes of democratization develop within a strictly constitutional framework. Any other path is unacceptable for honest citizens since it leads not to the affirmation of the law-governed state but to a situation in which anything goes—lack of respect for the law, anarchy and economic chaos. If today we allow ourselves to be drawn into political gambles and do not direct our efforts into saving the country's national economy from complete disintegration, then the collapse of the economy will become inevitable with the severest of consequences for every Soviet family.

The main thing today is to give people what is essential for normal human life—food, clothing, housing, the opportunity to work and to engage in creativity.

Without in the least belittling the importance of the further development of genuine democracy, I have to say directly that today the economy is is the main front in the battle for the future of our country, our children and grandchildren. It is long since time to build bridges and not to create obstacles in the life of society, to renounce the passions of rallies which are incompatible with the normal democratic process and to concentrate all the people's efforts on tackling burning social and economic problems. Our current msifortunes can only be exacerbated by strikes, hunger strikes, and anti-constitutional appeals and resolutions.

Representatives of some organizations and movements are trying to turn the national economy, the fruit of the labor of many generations, into a hostage of current demands of the political struggle. Surely this is what is demonstrated by their calls for mass political strikes and for undisguised pressure on the people's deputies of Russia, who will be gathering for their extraordinary congress on 28 March, right up to threats to organize their recall by voters.

The normal situation at enterprises, mines, and cultural centers is being disrupted with the help of unscrupulous speculation on our current difficulties and undisguised psychological pressure. Calls are being heard to turn the holiest place in the country, Red Square, into an arena for mass meetings.

The organizers of these actions are committing a criminal deception of people, frightening them with the specter of dictatorship. In fact, they themselves are resorting to force to satisfy their ambitious political goals.

The people themselves are responsible for the fate of our country today. It depends today on workers and those who work the land and on all working people whether we will be able to stop the fall in production and to start coming out of the crisis. The whole country is seeing and hearing with pain that because of a lack of coal coke oven batteries are getting cold, blast furnaces are being put

out, and metalworking is falling. Consequently, the production of agricultural machinery, fertilizers, and containers for canned goods and other products, which are so needed in the countryside, is threatened.

A normal preparation for sowing has been broken already, but whether we will have bread on the table tomorrow depends on it. Will the toilers really allow themselves to be carried away by gaudy calls and unconcealed demagogy and be under the thumb of the forces of political intriguers? Will we really set out on the path of destroying the institutions of people's power that have not yet had time to get strong and the very foundations of our multinational state and drive the people to the abyss of unpredictable troubles?

I call on every honest and sober-minded person to consider the danger of the threats looming over us, to recognize his responsibility for the fate of the country and the people, for the well-being of every family, for the future of our children.

In fulfilling the 21 March 1991 USSR Supreme Soviet decision, the USSR Cabinet of Ministers is taking measures to stabilize the situation in the country and considers it essential to ban holding rallies, pickets, street marches, and demonstrations in Moscow from 26 March to 15 April.

We consider it essential that these measures be taken in other regions of the country, too. These steps will be met with understanding by the working people and by everyone who lives by their own labor, whose shoulders support our country, and the well-being of its people. All forms of pressure on the peoples deputies of Russia must be excluded and all the conditions must be created for them to fulfill the will of their electors.

[Signed] V.S. Pavlov, USSR prime minister

Reaction to Demonstration Ban Reported

PM2703103191

[Editorial Report] Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 27 March 1991 carries on page one under the general headline "Storm Clouds Over the City. The Moscow City Soviet Has Given Permission for a Rally To Be Held 28 March. The Cabinet of Ministers Has Banned It. What Next?", a roundup of reports and short interviews regarding the ban on demonstrations and related matters. A boxed TASS report beneath the headline cites Gorbachev's decree placing I.F. Shilov, USSR first deputy minister of internal affairs, in charge of a new Ministry of Internal Affairs (MVD) administration to police Moscow and Moscow Oblast.

The roundup begins with the following report by A. Kosulnikov, published under the subhead "In the Moscow City Soviet":

"At a 'Democratic Russia' news conference held at the Moscow City Soviet yesterday, representatives of the movement stated that the 28 March rally in the center of the capital will nevertheless be held. The appeal that was disseminated says, in particular: 'We do not want civil war! Nor are we power-hungry extremists, as the government press is depicting us, although we constantly emphasize our commitment to constitutional means of political struggle.' The 'Democratic Russia' representatives called on RSFSR (Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic) people's deputies to make the holding of the extraordinary congress conditional on the repeal of the Cabinet of Ministers resolution.

"The Moscow City Soviet Presidium has decided to ask the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee to examine the Cabinet of Ministers resolution to establish whether it is in line with the existing Constitution and has left the Moscow Gorispolkom's (City Soviet Executive Committee's) decision in force.

"Today Moscow City Soviet deputies, as disclosed by Presidium member Aleksandr Osovtsov, are holding an emergency meeting, after which they will clearly lead the columns of demonstrators heading for Manezh Square."

The roundup continues with a report by A. Krayniy under the subhead "In the Division Named for Dzerzhinskiy" (the speaker in this report is not named):

" 'So far as the division named for Dzerzhinskiy is concerned, we have not yet received any orders to move into the city 28 March. We are Union troops, so far as we are concerned the president is the president and the minister of internal affairs is a minister.

" 'About the rumors. In recent days people have been saying that rubber batons have been issued to the division's officers. That is total rubbish!' "

Next, a report by I. Kadulin under the subhead "In the KGB Administration for Moscow and Moscow Oblast" states:

" 'In conjunction with the militia, our administration will keep track of centers of tension, and in the event of extreme situations we will act resolutely with all the means at our disposal,' Administration Chief V. Prilukov says.

" 'By force?'

" 'I repeat: We will act resolutely. But in strict accordance with existing legislation.' "

The roundup continues with the following quotation from V. Bakatin, member of the Security Council:

"If you want my personal opinion, I think that any bans do not exactly fit in the mainstream of democratic policy...

"If political forces have decided to organize a series of mass actions, let them go ahead and hold them.

"I am not going to comment on the Cabinet of Ministers decision—it should simply be fulfilled. Although perhaps the decision is rather hasty."

A report by S. Sokolov under the subhead "In the 'Communists of Russia' Group" states:

"Did you seek a ban on rallies in Moscow? We asked V. Gulyashko, one of the authors of the appeal to the president and a member of the 'Communists of Russia' deputies group, to answer that question:

" 'No, we did not have this in mind. All we were asking for is set out in our appeal. We wanted just one thing—to create normal conditions for the work of the congress and to save deputies from the insults, abuse, and threats that constantly accompany them on their way to sessions.'

" 'But surely in theory the local militia precinct could have calmly coped with this task on its own?'

" 'Of course it could have. But what can you do if neither the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, nor the RSFSR Council of Ministers, nor the Moscow City Soviet reacted to our request in any way.'"

The roundup continues with a 100-word quotation from Prime Minister Pavlov's 26 March appeal to the nation in which, referring to the ban on demonstrations in Moscow, he says: "We believe it is necessary for similar measures to be taken in other regions of the country also."

Next comes an unattributed report under the subhead "Regarding the Question of Dyarchy":

"As is well known, Vyacheslav Komissarov, chief of the USSR MVD Academy Retraining and Skill Enhancement Faculty, was appointed to the post of chief of the Moscow Gorispolkom Main Internal Affairs Administration by decision of a Moscow City Soviet session. The Union MVD disagreed with this decision, and Petr Bogdanov continued to perform the duties of chief. This was possible because the Main Internal Affairs Administration was under dual command—the city authorities and the Union ministry.

"Now both are out of a job."

The roundup goes on to quote V. Komissarov as saying:

"The USSR president's decree came as a total surprise to me. I simply cannot understand these games with state secrets. Both the decree and the USSR Cabinet of Ministers resolution are links in the same chain and strengthen, indeed, I would even say monopolize, the president's power.

"I would also like to know the mechanism for making the decision, which totally sidelined the corps of deputies in Moscow and the oblast."

Noting that "you can read V. Komissarov's proposals on surmounting the crisis in one of our next issues," KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA goes on to cite P. Bogdanov as commenting:

"I believe that the president's decree is very timely and will help to strengthen law and order and security in Moscow and the Moscow region."

An unattributed report under the subhead "Phone Call to the Paper" states:

"At 2050 we were called by a senior operations officer of the Oblast KGB Administration, who asked to remain anonymous and disclosed that yesterday the personnel of his department received the following orders (we quote a summary):

"Mass disorders are expected 28 March on the territory of the Kremlin. State security organs, and also servicemen of the Moscow Military District, will take measures to prevent these disorders. By noon each day all subunits of military counterintelligence organs must collect and relay to the center information about reactions to the upcoming Congress among troops and units:

"—about attitudes toward democratic forces;

"—whose side the servicemen are on (Gorbachev's or Yeltsin's);

"—about the possibility of civilian activists addressing the servicemen for purposes of propaganda and agitation, and also in order to obtain weapons."

The roundup concludes with the following unattributed remarks under the subhead "Instead of a Commentary":

"We have been to Baku, Vilnius, Karabakh, and Fergana. We think that the lives of a conservative and a democrat are equally important. We are wondering: How can a compromise be found in the present situation?

"We propose what may be a purely formal solution: Both the Cabinet decision and the USSR Supreme Soviet's warning speak OF THE IMPERMISSIBILITY OF DEMONSTRATIONS DURING WORKTIME. We have days in reserve, and there is every possibility of postponing the rally for 30 minutes. Thirty minutes. Will they perhaps be crucial?"

Bakatin Says Demonstration Ban Undemocratic

LD2603233791 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 26 Mar 91

[Text] Vadim Bakatin, USSR Security Council member, spoke to Soviet and foreign journalists at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs press center today. Replying to a question on the competence of the Cabinet of Ministers' decision to ban demonstrations, he said in part:

[Begin Bakatin recording] If you want to know my personal opinion, I think that, on the whole, any bans are not in accordance with the democratic policy which, I still continue to think, we follow. This is the foundation of Gorbachev's policy and the foundation of the policy of perestroyka. The statements by a number of political

forces that are very much concerned about the situation that is taking shape around the extraordinary Russian congress are worried about the fate of their leaders and therefore have decided to organize the whole series of mass actions. Personally, I think they should let them hold it.

Moreover, after the USSR Supreme Soviet adopted the decision you know about recommending the Moscow Soviet to refrain from holding these demonstrations, and the Moscow City Soviet, as it should have been expected, ignored this Supreme Soviet decision, all the responsibility has been laid on the Moscow City Soviet. I think everything would have been in order.

From the point of view of political, as is said, slogans, we have reached the highest point here: It seems there is nothing more to say here. Everybody is fed up with all this already. From the purely public security point of view there is a question here, because somebody here probably wants to make some provocations and by this to accuse the authorities later of not being capable of holding—how can I say this—social order at an appropriate level.

I will hope that Moscow citizens will turn out to be sufficiently law-abiding to implement this decision, though probably it is rather hasty. When in the end the law on Moscow's status as the capital of the USSR is adopted which, on the whole, we are still waiting for, and the Muscovites it seems in particular, then it seems these questions will not be asked by the audience anymore. [end recording]

Bakatin Urges Miners To Drop Political Demands

LD2603162191 Moscow TASS in English 1350 GMT 26 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow March 26 TASS—Vadim Bakatin, one of the two full-time members of the Soviet Security Council, will deal with domestic policy within the framework of the Soviet Security Council, Bakatin told a briefing here today.

He said the other, Yevgeniy Primakov, will concentrate on the country's economic security.

Bakatin noted that the concept for state security of the Soviet Union had not yet been worked out, but in a democratic society it should be based on equilibrium of political forces and support for the government.

To this end, corresponding institutes are being created. The activities of the council will be open, but to the degree that will not damage the country's security, he said.

Commenting on miners' walkouts in various Soviet regions, Bakatin said he can see a way out of the resulting political crisis only in the strikers' abandonment of political demands.

The president, he said, would never consider the miners' demands for his resignation "because this is unconstitutional".

Bakatin explained that "there is no constitutional mechanism that would determine the fate or future of any president depending on the interests of this or that professional group".

The Constitution says that the head of state enjoys immunity and can be removed only by the Congress of People's Deputies if he has violated the law rather than by strikes or through other actions, Bakatin told reporters.

The strikes, primarily their political demands, "stem from the Russian Congress and deputies' concern about the position of their leader" as well as from "direct calls by Russian deputies on miners to strike and pose these demands", he continued.

Bakatin hoped that the Russian Congress opening on Thursday will be marked not by "confrontation needed by absolutely no-one" but by a critical analysis, "with serious demands on the Russian Government and the Russian Supreme Soviet, which should govern Russia rather than just seek to lay the blame at the national leadership's door".

Bakatin reported data showing that the situation in some mining areas is getting back to normal. For example, all pits in Belovo, Kuzbass, have resumed operation.

Bakatin quoted the mining minister as saying that 126 out of the country's 600 mines are still on strike for a variety of reasons. Coal production on Monday stood at 1,800,000 tonnes, as compared with 2,600,000 tonnes planned. Coke production shortfalls that day amounted to a third of the planned total.

Bakatin expressed confidence that miners will soon discontinue their stoppage because "all economic issues raised by Kuzbass men have in principle been resolved and the president gave relevant instructions".

Asked about the reasons for banning rallies in Moscow, scheduled for Thursday, Bakatin noted that they would cause no danger from the point of view of political slogans. But they can be used for provocations and subsequent accusations against the authorities of their inability to maintain public order.

According to Bakatin, the cabinet's decision should be implemented, although it might have been somewhat hasty. Taking into account the fact that the Moscow Council ignored the Soviet parliament's recommendations to refrain from holding rallies, the Moscow Council bears all responsibility, he said.

In this connection, Bakatin is "worried" with the possible "opposition" between demonstrators and Interior Ministry and KGB forces instructed to obstruct the routes planned for rally columns. He said no arms or armoured vehicles will be used. Bakatin said it is a usual police action, "but there is nothing pleasant in it".

Bakatin described Ivan Shilov, appointed Soviet first deputy interior minister and head of the ministry's main department for Moscow and Moscow region, as an "experienced and reliable person deserving trust and respect".

Speaking about the Soviet president's decree withdrawing Moscow and regional police from subordination to corresponding councils, Bakatin noted that this is a temporary measure, and in future it should be correlated with a law on the status of Moscow.

Asked about Bakatin's relations with the president, including in connection with the January events in Vilnius, Bakatin said that he had criticised the position of the Soviet parliament and the president for his failure to "dissociate himself resolutely from clearly unconstitutional actions".

At the same time, Bakatin noted that Gorbachev was wrongly informed about the events in the Lithuanian capital. According to Bakatin, events in Vilnius were an attempt to overthrow the legally elected power. He said his position on the issue has not changed.

Gorbachev Meets Agro-Industrial Representatives

LD2603132191 Moscow World Service in English 1300 GMT 26 Mar 91

[Text] A meeting has started in the Kremlin between the Soviet President, Mikhail Gorbachev, and representatives of the country's agro-industrial complex. Taking part are leaders of collective and state-run farms and of other enterprises which have transformed to new forms of management. A serious conversation is going on about the food sphere becoming of top priority, despite the fact that many key industries would like to receive exceptional treatment. Those present noted the maximum must be done to increase the agricultural produce and food reserves. At the same time they stressed that the food problem is being successfully solved in places where they were bold enough to reform the production relations of the collective and state farms by developing lease, cooperative, and joint stock forms of property which make the farmer a genuine master who can freely dispose of the results of his labor.

Further on Meeting

LD2703101291 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 0700 GMT 27 Mar 91

[Text] On 26 March, in the CPSU Central Committee, there was a meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and the leaders of collective and state farms and other formations of the agro-industrial complex that had switched over to new forms of economic management and multisystem operation. It was stressed that, with all the current difficulties, it was necessary to create for the peasant conditions for his livelihood and to promote the social transformation of the countryside. The solution of the problem must be determined not through setting one form of economic management against another or through calls for eliminating public-sector production, but by means of ensuring the effective use of the production-economic potential already created.

Lukyanov on Importance of All-Union Referendum

LD2603210291 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 26 Mar 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] In Moscow today, the central commission on the USSR referendum summed up the final results of the population's vote on preserving the USSR as a renewed federation of equal sovereign republics.

Comrade Orlov, chairman of the central commission on the referendum, reported that nearly 186 million citizens of our country were included in the registers. A total of 148.5 million people, or 80 percent, have participated in the referendum. Of these, 113.5 million, or 76.4 percent, said yes to the Union. A total of 1.7 percent said no. Nearly 2 percent of the ballots were declared void. Details on the results of the voting in the Union and autonomous republics, as well as in the districts and localities in those republics where central commissions for the referendum were not formed, are being given in the official report.

Analyzing the results of the referendum, Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov and members of the commission have noted that it has been held already in the situation of a real political pluralism, under the difficult current situation:

[Begin Lukyanov recording] It is extremely important that the people, the majority of the adult population of the country—one can say this unequivocally, using any data—has voted for preserving the renewed Union of equal and sovereign republics. People have made this decision under a difficult economic situation and under the breakdown of the economic ties, the empty shelves, the queues. The people have firmly voted for the Union, and I think that in a significant measure this was explained by the fact that this was a responsibility not only for our country as it is currently but also was a responsibility for the whole of our history and for our future.

One should analyze not only the positive results of the referendum but also the negative ones, because the main signals were coming from the most acute areas of the political struggle. It is precisely to these areas that we should pay our close attention, first of all, to solving the economic, social, interethnic questions, and so on.

The referendum and its results command all the state organs, primarily the Supreme Soviet, to do their best to conclude the new Union treaty as soon as possible, to do their best to restore the broken economic ties as soon as possible, and to establish a dialogue with all the social forces.

We should go ahead in forming the all-Union market. It will be the most important centrifugal factor which will bring our renewed federation together. [end recording]

Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov thanked members of the central commission and hundreds of thousands of Soviet citizens who worked in more than 180,000 of the republican, town, and district commission for the referendum. Now, here is the final ceremony of ratification and the solemn signing of the protocol of the Union referendum. The detailed account of this will be published in the press.

Shatalin Hits Aspects of Draft Union Treaty

PM2603133991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Mar 91 Union Edition p 3

[Article by academician S. Shatalin: "A Few Remarks by an Economist"]

[Text] I answered "no" to the question on the Union referendum. I wrote on the ballot paper: "I consider it essential to create a Union of Sovereign States on the basis of an economic Union of Sovereign States." I would stress that the title of the USSR is not disclosed in the draft Union treaty on the Union of Sovereign Republics (correctly—states) for reasons difficult to explain. Since I voted in Washington and was not given a Russian ballot paper, I added to the Union paper: "I consider it essential to introduce the post of president of the Russian Federation. I signed all this and ensured my signature was legible. When my people's future is at stake, I want no "secret" decisions, but flatly refuse to impose my own modus operandi on anyone.

But now let us get down to the nitty-gritty.

1. I consider it unacceptable to submit for nationwide discussion a draft treaty which does not even mention the name of the country—the USSR. Or is the hope, after holding a referendum in which not all republics participate, to leave everything as it was—soviet, socialist? But even the draft treaty, after all, proposes that "the republics constituting the Union possess full state power (that cannot be in a federation—S.Sh.), autonomously determine their own national-state and administrative-territorial system," and have free choice of forms of ownership, thus private ownership, too. Is this consonant with socialism according to the CPSU and Russian Communist Party? If the republics in setting up their own national-state system abandon the "soviets"? Why, then, in that case was it necessary to go to all the trouble and hold a Union referendum? Or is it now possible to adopt a new Union treaty "adjusted" in line with it? But who will put their signature to that house of cards?

2. Article Seven "Ownership" says that the USSR and republics ensure the free development and protection of all forms of ownership envisaged by the legislation of the USSR and the republics. But this assertion is made up of two incompatible elements and contradicts the "fourth" item in the "Basic Principles" section. Will the USSR ensure the free development and protection of private ownership of land in Russia if it is banned by USSR legislation? The assertion that "Republics are the owners of the land, its subsoil, and other natural resources on their territory..." is a reflection of the state-feudal condition of our economy, where everything comes under 'Union,' 'republic,' or 'local' jurisdiction." The introduction, for example, of the institutiuon of private ownership of land automatically means that it is not the property of either the republic or the USSR.

3. We must not constantly confuse the concepts of "state" and "republic"—the latter is a specific instance of a state—yet republics (?) themselves "determine their own state-national system"; and what if one of them "takes it into its head" to declare itself a kingdom? Like Britain, there democracy seems to be in good shape and all kinds of property are protected, although no one actually attacks it. Save sometimes state property.

4. The draft treaty makes a number of assertions about the members of the federation and the nature of relations among them—"each republic party to the treaty is a sovereign state," "republics parties to the treaty are members of the Union either directly or as part of other republics," "relations among republics, one of which is part of another republic, are regulated by treaties and agreements among them," "republics... autonomously determine their own national-state system"—which sharply accentuate separatism, are self-contradictory, could lead to a substantial fragmentation of statehood, and are to a considerable extent directed against the integrity of the Russian Federation. While the imposition upon the USSR of the power to "defend the sovereignty and national integrity of the Union and its constituent republics" is a rare manifestation of "centrist unitarism," the imperial ambition of "the center," and a patent limitation on the "present" sovereignty of the "present" Union republics.

5. Article Five "Demarcation of Powers in the USSR" is shot through with the "central-imperial" position. The state-political aspect of this was already dealt with in part earlier. I will dwell now only on certain aspects of the demarcation of Union and republic economic powers:

—it is quite unclear why the "leadership" of defense enterprises and organizations involved in creating and manufacturing arms and military hardware is necessary to the Union. Such "leadership" is not necessary for republics either if we have really decided to have done with the feudal "Union-republic economy"; in the United States these enterprises are private and produce, as the war in the Persian Gulf showed,

perfectly decent equipment, and as for civil production there is nothing to say;

—it is also unclear what is meant by joint "management" by the Union and republics of the country's unified (?) fuel and energy system and various kinds of transport or that all this should be state—"Union" and "republic"—"property."

6. The draft treaty, which confirms all the principles of today's utterly inefficient system of executive-administrative power, does not even pose the problem of power at local-municipal level.

Metallurgy Workers Plan 'Unionwide Action'

PM2603102591 Moscow TRUD in Russian 26 Mar 91 p 2

[A. Krestyaninov report: "If the Government Fails to Respond, Metallurgy Workers Will Launch Actions"]

[Text] A Unionwide action in defense of the vital interests of the sector's working people is planned in the country's metallurgical enterprises for Wednesday 27 March.

These collective actions are undertaken in reply to a call by the USSR Mining and Metallurgical Industry Working People's Trade Unions Federation Council and the "Soyuzmetal" Trade Union Center.

This is the first time that miners and metallurgy workers are resorting to such a widespread protest action. This is not yet a strike, and it is to be hoped that there will be no production stoppages. But the sector's working people are increasingly loudly declaring their support for the economic demands presented by striking miners. They insist that all questions concerning coal miners be solved by the government simultaneously with the problems of workers in metallurgy and other of industry's base sectors.

The metallurgy workers demand that their wages be at least doubled. Their demands of the government also include other points. Specifically, that Union and republic pension legislation be brought in line so as to establish identical benefits for the sector's working people regardless of their place of residence; that additional money from the stabilization fund (approximately 2.6 billion rubles) be allocated to the population's social security fund, so as to enable working people in all sectors to retain their present level of social security for at least some time.

Television Correspondent on 'Press Freedom'

AU2603122991 Budapest NEPSZAVA in Hungarian 22 Mar 91 p 2

[Interview with Soviet television correspondent Yuriy Rostov by Csaba Szerdahelyi on the telephone from the Soviet Union; date not given: "You Are Free To Land on the Street"—first two paragraphs are NEPSZAVA introduction]

[Text] Yuriy Rostov tells me that glasnost and democracy are not at all in danger in the Soviet Union—at first I think I have misheard him. In the next sentence, everything becomes clear: Rostov continues by saying that only things that exist can be in danger. Glasnost is something that certain comrades have simply been lulling you with for a long time.

Nevertheless, Yuriy Rostov is not disappointed. He would have every reason to be disappointed, given that they gave him his work card back on Monday [18 March].

[Szerdahelyi] You are one of the most popular leading correspondents of the Soviet "TSN" news magazine. Or rather, you used to be one of its most popular correspondents. Did the chairman's decision surprise you?

[Rostov] The decision did not surprise me, but the extremely quick handling of the case did take me aback. The fact that they gave me and two of my colleagues our work cards back was almost inevitable, considering the situation in this country and in Soviet central television. I do not understand the panicking nature of this dismissal. Indeed, we did not even have to go through the formal labyrinth of employment termination.

[Szerdahelyi] I would not think that chairman Kravchenko's staff are afraid of such procedures. Am I wrong?

[Rostov] Oh no, there is no talk of fear! I suppose that the execution of such decisions can be awkward in certain circles, and that is why they smooth things out with such speed.

[Szerdahelyi] Does public opinion not matter?

[Rostov] Please do not be naive! Who cares about the protest letters of a few thousand viewers, or even 10,000 viewers? Are you aware of the size of our waste-paper baskets at Soviet television? Nevertheless, I do not want to be ironic, I am not really in the mood for that. So, public opinion ceased to matter a long time ago, and there is no point in denying it, our public opinion is very divided—about as divided as the masses demonstrating outside the Kremlin. One day they cheer for Yeltsin, and the next for Gorbachev.

[Szerdahelyi] Are you disappointed in the masses?

[Rostov] No. It would be impossible for me to be disappointed because they have manipulated people to an extent that you would not believe. Physical hunger is now being joined by an increasing spiritual hunger, and people are absorbing everything without stopping to think. Yes, we have become omnivorous in this "information shop"; for example, all newspapers are sold by early morning. People buy PRAVDA to the same extent as OGONYOK. They buy these newspapers because they

have no choice; through administrative means, the authorities have once again tried to push the so-called reform-minded press into a corner.

[Szerdahelyi] Is that the freedom of the press in the Soviet Union today?

[Rostov] Oh, who is talking about freedom of the press?! The press is being manipulated once again, clearly following instructions from the Kremlin. I could say that those who do not like this practice are making themselves scarce, but that is not true, because the most stubborn people—like ourselves—believe in freedom of expression. Well, these people believe in vain.

[Szerdahelyi] Do interest representation groups not have anything to say about all this?

[Rostov] What could they say, given that they are at the service of government organizations?

[Szerdahelyi] What happens next?

[Rostov] I am confident that I will not remain unemployed, but I am aware that a hard struggle awaits me—or rather, awaits us.

Hunger Strike Protesting Appointment Continues

PM2603124991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Mar 91 Union Edition p 6

[Report by A. Illesh and V. Rudnev: "Moscow City Soviet Deputies Go Hungry"]

[Text] Nine Moscow City Soviet deputies—members of the commission for legality and law and order—are continuing their hunger strike to protest against the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] Collegium decision refusing to confirm V. Komissarov in the post of chief of the Moscow City Main Administration for Internal Affairs. They began their hunger strike 20 March....

The "battle" for the post of chief of Moscow's militia has already been covered in detail in the press. Let us, nonetheless, recall its gist. On 23 January a Moscow City Soviet session relieved P. Bogdanov of his duties as chief of the Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee Main Administration for Internal Affairs and appointed another militia general, V. Komissarov, to this post. On 4 February this Moscow City Soviet resolution was suspended by decision of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Collegium, and Lieutenant General P. Bogdanov was instructed "to continue to discharge his official duties in the leadership of the Moscow City internal affairs organs." On 5 February Moscow City Soviet deputies tried to enter the Main Administration for Internal Affairs premises to introduce their appointee to the militia personnel. The deputies were stopped at the gate. Hence the hunger strike.

Who is right? Who is wrong? There are several opinions on this subject. But first a quotation from the deputies' statement.

"We, people's deputies, having exhausted the legislative methods of struggle available to us today, are forced to resort to a radical form of protest by declaring a hunger strike. In doing so we want to draw the attention of the public and the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet to the continuing arbitrary actions of USSR Minister of Internal Affairs General B. Pugo. With the obvious connivance of the USSR President he continues stubbornly to ignore the Moscow City Soviet session decision.... This serves to discredit the organs of power elected by the people and to unjustifiably politicize the law and order enforcement services to the detriment of the implementation of their main functions."

Now a statement by V. Maksimov, chairman of the Moscow City Soviet subcommision for law and order:

The collegium decision which is preventing V. Komissarov from taking up his post is unlawful. A consultative organ does not have the right to suspend the decisions of an acting legal organ of power. Our numerous appeals to the leadership of the country and the USSR MVD have, alas, failed to produce results. The powers "go about their business" calmly and in silence. In these circumstances the deputies are forced to resort to an act of desperation. Unfortunately, there is virtually no hope that our demands for the restoration of legality will be met in the current circumstances....

V. Komissarov, USSR MVD Academy department head:

I do not approve of the hunger strike in protest against the USSR MVD Collegium decision which prevents me from taking up my new post. No one has consulted me on this, and I learned about it only as a fait accompli. In general, I believe that the Moscow deputies who are determined to place me in the post of chief of the Main Administration for Internal Affairs should behave with more restraint. Emotional behavior will not resolve this problem. Pickets, demonstrations, and rallies can be of no assistance in such a matter. In my opinion the situation may be resolved with the adoption of the law on Moscow's status. This is because confusion as to the capital's legal position lies at the heart of the dispute concerning the post of chief of the Main Administration for Internal Affairs. For the time being it is necessary to wait.

Yu. Ovchinnikov, USSR Prosecutor's Office administration chief:

People's deputies have consulted us on the collegium decision. However, we have been unable to find legal grounds for submitting a prosecutor's office appeal.

From a letter sent by G. Popov, chairman of the Moscow City Soviet, to S. Alekseyev, president of the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee:

"Most Esteemed Sergey Sergeyevich! I ask you, on your own initiative, to examine the question of the compliance with the USSR Consitution of the USSR Council of Ministers resolution 'On the Introduction of the Post of USSR Deputy Minister of Internal Affairs for the Chief of the Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee Main Administration for Internal Affairs.'"

From the Editorial Office.

The situation is truly an unusual one. Unfortunately, neither we journalists nor the legal experts whom we have consulted can furnish an unequivocal answer as to who is right and who is wrong here. On the one hand, the Main Administration for Internal Affairs is part of the Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee (after all, it is the Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee's Main Administration for Internal Affairs), and who, if not the deputies, should decide the question of the appointment of its chief. But, on the other, the chief of the Moscow Militia is simultaneously also a USSR deputy minister of internal affairs. It seems logical that the minister should decide who is going to be his deputy. So they are both deciding, each in his own way.

Alas, the brand new Law on the Militia which has only just been adopted does not provide the answer, either just to this specific question or indeed to other, broader questions. So whose militia is it today? Does it belong to the soviets? The point is that under this law the militia is "an armed state law enforcement organization." The soviets of people's deputies may only "monitor the work of the militia, excluding its criminal procedure, administrative jurisdiction, and operational investigation activities."

Gorbachev Aide Recommends Political 'Compromise'

PM2603141791 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 23 Mar 91 p 13

[Interview with "Gorbachev political adviser" Andrey Grachev by Enrico Franceschini in Moscow; date not given]

[Text] Moscow—The "second perestroyka" began with the victory for national unity in the referendum, and its success depends on the radicals' decisions: Will they abandon their utopian dreams or become "new Bolsheviks"? This is how Andrey Grachev, one of Gorbachev's closest political advisers, interprets last Sunday's vote, and in this interview with LA REPUBBLICA he tells how the reformist venture begun six years ago could end.

[Franceschini] Is the "yes" to the Union a personal victory for Gorbachev?

[Grachev] It is difficult to speak of victory in the crisis situation in which we find ourselves. The paradox is that the referendum outcome contains a victory for Gorbachev and a victory for society in the broader sense. The referendum had been turned from a political and economic issue into a vote of confidence or no confidence in the president. Moreover, it took place in such an atmosphere of tension that, in my opinion, no Western government would have held such an important vote under similar conditions. So there is no doubt that the 76 percent "yes" vote for the Union is a success for Gorbachev, but the president is not the only winner. Yeltsin and the radicals, too, in winning the referendum on the direct election of the president of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, also achieved the result for which they hoped. Nevertheless, I believe that they would be making a grave mistake if they regarded it as support for their anti-Gorbachev stances; and, for his part, Gorbachev would be mistaken to regard his "yes" votes as a go-ahead for attacking the radicals. The truth is that on Sunday two different stances won, almost with the same votes, and in this sense it was a victory for pluralism, the victory of a whole, more mature, society, which did not want to give either side an unambiguous, outright mandate and did not want our society's future to be determined by a majority at the minority's expense.

[Franceschini] There is a great deal of talk about a new centrist line on Gorbachev's part: Is it a new stage in perestroyka?

[Grachev] I believe so. We have reached the time for compromises between the contending political forces. I believe that they are necessary and unavoidable. Certainly, much depends on the radicals' strategy. If they succumb to the temptation of continuing to press for the fall of the current government, they will become new Bolsheviks; but I hope that this will not happen. Gorbachev's centrism represents a new stage in perestroyka which differs from the first and represents the necessary compromise between a blueprint for renewal and society's conservatism. When I say "conservatism" I am speaking not just about the bureaucracy, the party apparatus, and elements in the Armed Forces but of a broader attitude: I am talking about the masses' mentality, society's fear of the changes, and the philosophy of egalitarianism at all costs which has dominated us for 70 years. This set of conservative trends has necessitated a correction of the course of perestroyka, of the speed of the reform movement. But it is a movement which can no longer be stopped and cannot turn back. The radicals say that the center has allied itself with the right in order to retain power, and that it has betrayed perestroyka. But they do not want reforms: They want a revolution; that is, they want to tear everything down. But a compromise is now needed between the market economy, pluralism, and social justice. Every society decides how to combine these three factors, and every generation has its own view of how to achieve them. I do not know what we should call this project—socialism with a human and democratic face, or something else: Perhaps the next generation will decide.

[Franceschini] You say that the voters do not want the majority to impose its will on the minority, and this is why they split their votes between Gorbachev and Yeltsin. But on Thursday the Soviet legislature ordered

the six separatist republics, which boycotted the referendum, to respect the verdict delivered at the polls by the other nine republics.

[Grachev] But the legislature's declaration is a political declaration; it does not mean that tomorrow Soviet troops will march against the rebel republics. There were exaggerated fears on both sides about this referendum. A "no" to the Union, it was said, would bring anarchy; a "yes" would bring dictatorship. But it was just propaganda, typical of any election campaign, and these fears are not destined to come true. The only real danger is that the radicals may start to challenge the government outside the constitutional limits. Something similar happened in West Europe in the seventies: Unfortunately, history's lessons are never learned.

[Franceschini] Gorbachev won the referendum with the "yes" votes of "Holy Russia"—the most backward part of the country—while the intelligentsia of the cities—the most progressive part of the country, which in theory has benefited most from glasnost and perestroyka—voted against him. Does this not seem to you strange?

[Grachev] It seems to me above all sad, but an unfavorable vote by the intellectuals is a Russian tradition. In our country, the intelligentsia can never rid themselves of their utopian consciences. It is curious that, 70 years after the October Revolution, the same mistakes are being repeated. There is today among many radicals the same hope of being able to accelerate history, the same lack of understanding of the fact that the problem is that of living in a real society, not the society in which we would like to exist. But I believe that I have recently glimpsed signs of greater reasonableness among the radicals—or at least among some of them.

[Franceschini] There are also realistic reformers who do not believe in utopia, such as former Interior Minister Bakatin, who has been called by Gorbachev to serve on the new National Security Council and who defended the President against the striking miners' accusations; such as Aleksandr Yakovlev, the president's former right-hand man, who has championed national unity; and such as former Foreign Minister Shevardnadze, who always makes constructive criticism of Gorbachev. Why does the president not take men like him back to his side?

[Grachev] It also depends on them—not just on Gorbachev. But perhaps it is best not to dive into the same water twice. New people are needed, and it is natural that this should be so. The first stage of perestroyka—the stage of storming the citadel, of combating stereotypes, the heroic and romantic stage of courage and battle, the stage of destruction—is over. Now the stage of tedious, slow, and patient work is beginning, and not everybody is suited to taking part in it.

[Franceschini] So should Gorbachev, who led the first stage, also go?

[Grachev] He should not, because back in 1985 he was saying "we cannot live like this" but he was concerned then, too, about the country's internal and international stability. Gorbachev has always realized that, once the decision had been taken to go in a certain direction, there could be no turning back, but he has also realized that hew could not make progress on his own; he had to win over the whole of society.

[Franceschini] How long will this new stage last? How far off is victory for perestroyka? Will we have to wait for a new generation of "children of perestroyka"—the young people who have grown up in the reformist atmosphere of the Gorbachev years—to come to power?

[Grachev] I personally feel that I am already experiencing this victory. Perestroyka has achieved its aim, because it is now impossible to return to the society of the past. Where and when the reformist movement will end, nobody can tell. In one sense it can be said that we have already won, and in another that we will never win, because reformism is a constantly ongoing project, and I hope that it will never end.

Alksnis Makes Case for 'Salvation' Coalition

PM2603101191 Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 24 Mar 91 p 4

["Exclusive" article by USSR People's Deputy Colonel Viktor Alksnis: "Gorbachev Must Resign"]

[Text] It is my view that perestroyka has failed. That is not only my personal view: Nikolay Ryzhkov said the same at the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies in December last year. Of the Soviet politicians who initiated perestroyka is 1985 he is probably the first to have doubts about its success. It is time to admit that the road we have followed for five years has turned out to be wrong and that steps must be taken to correct the situation. I would say that today it has already become necessary to start a perestroyka of perestroyka.

In 1985 Mikhail Gorbachev came to the fore as the leader of perestroyka. The ideas contained in perestroyka won majority support. I believe that even today they are shared by the majority of the country's inhabitants. Unfortunately Gorbachev has been unable to propose a route to the goals set forth. He had a demolition program, but was unable to formulate a construction program. When the command management and administration system was demolished it was necessary at the same time to found new structures which could replace those that were demolished.

But this was not done. Then the inevitable happened: If you pull down the walls of a house, the roof falls in on your head.

This is one of the most profound causes of the current crisis situation in the country: Gorbachev had and still has no constructive program for perestroyka. It ought also to be said that the whole system of soviets, which

served as a cover for the party and state apparatus, has shown itself to be paralyzed. Today the soviets are incapable of making decisions and—more importantly—when they make decisions they are incapable of securing their implementation.

Gorbachev was the man who took the initiative for perestroyka, and he naturally plays a major role. But today he unfortunately finds himself in a very difficult position: He is being subjected to criticism from all sides; it has to be said that this criticism is justified, and public confidence in him is constantly on the decline.

In purely human terms it is of course possible to feel sympathy for President Gorbachev. But we should not forget that he is to a large extent responsible for what is now happening to our country. I consider it out of the question—in the field of aviation there is the expression the "point of no return." Once a pilot has passed that point it is impossible for him to return to base—there is not enough fuel. That is why I think that Gorbachev must resign and new people take over the leadership of the country.

The tragic thing is that there is no power at all in our country. Neither Gorbachev nor Yeltsin has power, and the same is also true of Landsbergis in Lithuania, for example. But no state can exist in a state of powerlessness. How are you to be able to carry through economic reforms without having power behind you? As I have already said, the Soviet system is paralyzed. Therefore, during a transitional phase, the existing state structures have to be completely transformed.

I advocate the formation of a committee for the salvation of the Soviet Union. But, unlike the variation on this that was attempted in the Baltic region, this committee must only be created through democratic channels. Since there is no mention of anything like this in the present constitution, the constitution must be amended. This could be done at the Congress of People's Deputies which also has the authority to form a salvation committee.

The Congress of People's Deputies would form this committee on a coalition basis. I advocate that it should include prominent representatives of the most diverse political movements: right-wing, left-wing, and centrist forces. The only precondition is that they should temporarily shelve their party conflicts and begin to work for the salvation of the country. If such a committee is given the necessary powers it will be able to lead the country out of the crisis.

Will society approve such a method of saving perestroyka? It is difficult for me to answer that question. I can only say that it is one of the possible alternatives. Moreover there are not very many people who still talk about perestroyka today. The very word seems to be starting to cause an allergy.

It has been said that this alternative is a political utopia, that it would be the same as putting Bolsheviks and Mensheviks in the same boat. But there are more recent examples. In the Central Committee Politburo we have had both "right-wing" and "left-wing" people at the same time—for example, Aleksandr Yakovlev, who can be counted a social democrat, and Yegor Ligachev, an orthodox communist.

That is why I propose that we make use of the Politburo's experience, this time to create a body beyond parties, a salvation committee which unites people with diametrically opposed views—communists, social democrats, christian democrats, monarchists. When it is a matter of life and death—not only for the state, but also for actual people—different sorts of people can come together in the same boat.

I can assure my readers that if the question is posed in this way both Comrade Sobchak, Leningrad's "radical" mayor, and Comrade Polozkov, the "conservative" leader of Russia's Communist Party, will pull together and will also find time to bail out the boat between pulls on the oars. But without the support of society the committee cannot succeed: In order to emerge from the crisis it will have to resort to tough measures, especially in the economic field.

I myself am not ashamed to be counted among the conservatives. Thatcher and Reagan were conservatives. There is a sound kernel in conservatism. As a fellow people's deputy—who also has "colonel's epaulets"—once asked me: What would you do if the troops who look after the strategic missiles became left-wing radicals?

In my view the majority of members of the Soviet Communist Party have conservative views. It is clear, the relative strengths in society as a whole do not favor the so-called democratic forces. Two years ago the ideas being put forward by the democrats were attractive and people voted in the elections for a radical course, but today disappointment clearly prevails. The people have tired of politics, they see that the great number of speeches does not put more goods on the stores' shelves. The longing for a firm hand and strong power which can bring about calm and order in the country is growing ever stronger.

I am a supporter of multiparty democracy. But I realize that this is impossible under present circumstances. Democracy can only grow in the soil of law and order. Alfred Nobel was indeed right when he said at the end of the nineteenth century that a democracy which does not rest the power of the law leads to the dictatorship of the mob. It is necessary for the laws to begin to work in our society. On their foundation a civilized rule-of-law state with a normal multiparty system should be built.

A society in which there is no opposition is doomed to stagnation. But today the preconditions do not really exist for a multiparty system. Just compare the multimillion giant of the CPSU to parties which have 5,000 or 10,000 members!

We must move toward democracy step by step, particularly in the economic field, where market relations and pluralism in the forms of ownership must be introduced. I consider that private ownership has as much justification as state ownership. But with one restriction: The land, I would say, is a gift from God and the farmer must become lord over it, but without having the right to buy or sell land.

Some people assert that the Soviet Union is in the process of falling apart, and I have to agree with them: The Union is falling apart. Nationalist feelings are growing ever stronger; in the political arena reason is giving way to emotions.

The worst thing that is happening is that everyone is doing his level best to grab himself the biggest possible piece of the all-Union cake. There are republics which want to be politically independent, but, at the same time, receive subsidies from the center. Processes are in motion which are razing to the ground the common economic "space" and preventing the creation of a market economy.

One proposal that has been made runs as follows: Let us give the republics all their sovereign rights, and then they will return some to central power. I do not agree. No state in world history has yet been built up from below.

It needs no "iron chancellor" to enable the country to unite. In the history of our own state there have been leaders who put an end to the rule of petty princes. What we have to build is a new nation, based on normal federative principles which are the same everywhere—in the United States or in Belgium.

In conclusion, I would state that I would of course prefer a civilian as president. The Army is a tool of the state and must be subordinate to the country's civilian leadership.

Shatalin Interviewed on Political Situation

PM1903140191 Paris LE FIGARO in French 16-17 Mar 91 p 2

[Interview with Soviet Economist Stanislav Shatalin by Pierre Bocev in Moscow; date not given]

[Text] This 57-year-old economist with political aspirations claims to be the economic conscience of the USSR. He has reasons for claiming this role: He trained as an economist and mathematician, is a member of the Academy of Sciences, and is regarded as one of the fiercest defenders of the market economy. Mikhail Gorbachev chose him as a personal adviser and promoted him to the Presidential Council. But his 500 days program was eventually rejected by the Kremlin, and Stanislav Shatalin broke with Gorbachev, just as he resigned publicly from the Communist Party. He received LE FIGARO in his office at the Central Economic Mathematics Institute.

[Bocev] The referendum about the future of the USSR and the future Union treaty has been the main issue for the regime and the opposition for weeks now. Where do you stand in this debate?

[Shatalin] The draft text of the treaty was published a week ago. It is very, very poor. But I do not want to comment on it in detail on the eve of the referendum.

[Bocev] How are you going to vote?

[Shatalin] What about the confidentiality of the ballot box and freedom of conscience? Look, there are obvious facts. The document does not even say what our country is to be called. So far as I am concerned, I am in favor of a Union of Sovereign States. We should begin with an economic union.

What interests me is what we can do together in the economic sphere. The states can enjoy total political sovereignty, but the terms of the economic union must be clear and well defined. That is what the 500 days program is about. Then, on that basis, we can establish what we like, whether a federation or a confederation.

[Bocev] Could Lithuania join then?

[Shatalin] A representative of Lithuania did indeed sign the 500 days program. The ambassadors of Hungary and Czechoslovakia also summoned me to ask if they could join the economic union. That is my answer, that is the reality.

[Bocev] In fact the reality is different: There is what you proposed, and there is what Mikhail Gorbachev did. You have broken with him and left the Communist Party.

[Shatalin] When I was the president's adviser I supported his views, which I also helped to shape. But Mikhail Gorbachev's economic policy was not correct, I left the party, and I am now an independent politician.

My break with Gorbachev was a personal drama. It was a difficult decision, as difficult as the break with the Communist Party. Nevertheless, I still have trust in the president.

[Bocev] But he has changed his policy. He is relying on the KGB, the Army, the police, the military-industrial complex, and the Communist Party apparatus. Is he not the hostage of these conservative forces?

[Shatalin] I disagree. He has a choice. He has room for maneuver. He does have it, and that imposes all the greater responsibility on him. You know, there is a key moment in a man's life every morning when he is shaving and he looks in the mirror, he is alone with himself. You ask yourself lots of questions about yourself. I wonder what answers Gorbachev might come up with, Gorbachev who is completely on his own.

[Bocev] On his own?

[Shatalin] His tragedy is that he has an entourage which is not equal to things. That is his biggest mistake. It used

to be different. There were people who were his comrades, who were intellectually at the same level, and who had their own opinion. But now....

[Bocev] You are one of the people, like Boris Yeltsin, who tried to convince him of the need to form an alliance with the new democratic forces. Why did he not listen to you?

[Shatalin] It is not that simple. You have to try to understand him. To be leader in this uncivilized country, and for six years.... This country is terrible. You may crack, and that can happen to anyone. We have no right to judge the politician only, we must take into account the human context.

Having said that, I have the impression that he incorrectly assesses the political situation.

[Bocev] But is it he who is radicalizing his relations with the new democrats?

[Shatalin] Certainly. He is rejecting the democrats. I told him that he should overcome his suspicion of them. Yeltsin, Popov, Sobchak, and Shatalin would never think of hanging Gorbachev. Whereas the right.... Unfortunately Mikhail Sergeyevich does not understand that.

Obviously, it remains to be seen whether he is prepared to turn back toward the democrats. That is a very difficult, extremely difficult question. He has the intellectual and human capacity for that. He could become the leader of this democratic bloc. I am no more stupid than the next person, but I find the Gorbachev phenomenon elusive.

[Bocev] In these conditions what do you intend to do with him, or more probably without him?

[Shatalin] For the moment I am a member of no party. But the emerging democratic parties should be able to form a kind of "Civic Forum," a real opposition to the Communist Party, while retaining their identity. I will take part in the creation of a new party, perhaps a Western-type social democratic party. But everything anticommunist and all these ideas of a tribunal against the CPSU must be rejected.

We must not be neo-Bolshevik, we must not call for vengeance. Otherwise we will be recreating the evil that we want to get rid of. We need not an anticommunist party, but a noncommunist party. I want to hear no more talk of "anti." We must be for, we must act, do something positive, build. There is clearly a need for an organized, powerful, and structured party, but not modeled on the CPSU's structures and methods.

[Bocev] What place do you see for Boris Yeltsin in this grouping?

[Shatalin] I know people say he is a dictator. Take Churchill, he was prepared to make a pact with the devil so long as that could serve Britain. I say that this "dictator" listens to ordinary people, and that is very important. Once he is in power, it is said, we will regret it. I do not know.

What I do know, what I see is that there is no bread. I do not know what dictatorship by Yeltsin is. If the dictator does what the democrats tell him to do, at the right time. If he gives land to the peasants, if he opens the doors to the West, if he does not ideologize the economy, then fine, let him be a dictator!

[Bocev] What about the present government?

[Shatalin] I am totally opposed to what it has done, and one of my main tasks is to ensure its resignation. That is a total priority. These people are not economists, they have no understanding of the market. They want nothing to do with it. Above all, no one has any confidence in them.

[Bocev] What would you do if, by a wave of a magic wand, you had sweeping powers?

[Shatalin] First fire the government. The road is perfectly clear: the market economy. We will have to travel this road. Millimeter by millimeter if necessary, but we will have to do it. The three pillars are the economic union, private ownership, and free enterprise.

[Bocev] What about the threat of civil war that is perturbing everyone today?

[Shatalin] Civil war? Nonsense!

Indications of Russian CP Purge Seen

PM2703120591 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 23 Mar 91 p 1

[S. Drozdov commentary: "How a Communist Was Hounded"]

[Text] V. Mironenko, first secretary of the Komsomol [All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League] Central Committee 1986 through 1990: I do not agree with this decision. I think it is a mistake. I do not think that Smirnov is the most loathsome of the members of the CPSU who should have been publicly punished.

V. Zyukin, first secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee:

I would not like to think that Stas' case is symptomatic of a return to intolerance.

I intend to suggest to our primary party organization where Stanislav is registered that it examine this issue.

Among the chairmen of Russian legislative committees no more communists remain. Stanislav Smirnov, head of the Committee for Young People's Affairs, was the last.

The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Control Commission Presidium has expelled Smirnov from the CPSU. He was expelled for violating human rights.

So, Stanislav Smirnov spent 15 of his 37 years—including his adult life—in Komsomol work. He started his career as deputy secretary of an institute Komsomol committee and ended it as second secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee. Throughout these 15 years Smirnov was a member of the CPSU and therefore his relations with it were most natural.

In June 1988, on the eve of the 19th party conference the first secretary of the Moscow City Komsomol Committee said that he would resolutely object to attempts to devalue the Komsomol's role as the party's youth organization.

During the RSFSR people's deputy election campaign, incidentally, he was backed by the "Democratic Russia" bloc despite the fact that he was both a communist and a Komsomol functionary.

Smirnov stood down at the Russian Komsomol constituent congress during the elections of the "top man," and became chairman of the Committee for Young People's Affairs.

A hullabaloo flared up over the committee's decision "On the Departyization of RSFSR Educational Establishments," which Smirnov signed in his capacity as chairman. We will quote it in full in view of the tremendous amount of rumor and conjecture that this document generated and also in view of the fact that very few people have seen it.

"The RSFSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Young People's Affairs, deeming it inadmissible for sociopolitical parties, organizations, and movements, including youth and children's movements, to be present in educational establishments, proposes:

"1. With a view to bringing existing practice into line with Articles 6 and 7 of the RSFSR Constitution, to ban the activity of sociopolitical parties, organizations, and movements in the republic's educational establishments and their management organs.

"2. To ban agitation and propaganda on behalf of a particular political party, organization, or movement in educational establishments.

"3. To abolish examination in educational disciplines whose immediate deideologization does not seem possible.

"4. To change educational syllabuses with a view to stopping teaching of ideologized subjects.

"In the committee's opinion, maximum tact and an individual approach, particularly with regard to younger pupils, should be an indispensable condition in the execution of the said decision.

"The RSFSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Young People's Affairs proposes that the Ministry of Education (Comrade E.D. Dneprov) and the State Committee for Affairs of Science and Higher Schooling (Comrade N.G. Malyshev) formulate steps to departyize educational establishments and their management organs and submit material for consideration to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Young People's Affairs."

Here is the result. We have not for a long time had a situation where a man in a lofty state post has been expelled from the party for political reasons.

A.P. Dumachev, member of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Control Commission Presidium, (he was head of youth vocational and technical education in the past):

"If Smirnov had simply voiced a viewpoint, there would be no complaints. But he authorized and carried out subversive action against educational establishments' party organizations, thus backing opposition forces. This document is aimed straight at the CPSU.

According to A.P. Dumachev, 33 party organizations at educational establishments in Moscow Oblast alone collapsed under the influence of this document.

Thus, "departyization is a forced issue that has been brought up deliberately today—the aim being to oust the CPSU from state, public, and other structures, and, simply, from the economy."

That is what I.K. Polozkov said.

What does Smirnov himself think?

"A person cannot be outside politics today. It is not politics itself that we want to remove from our schools, but the diktat imposed by political structures and that of narrow class and group interests. There should be no children in this arena. If we do not take preemptive steps today, in six months or a year, cells and groups of most varied hues and nuances will appear in our schools and VUZ's [higher educational establishments]. One can only guess at the consequences that this will have. But it will be a tragedy. Unfortunately, not all political parties realize that."

Smirnov is also being blamed for the illegality of the adopted document—something that was also confirmed by the USSR Prosecutor's Office. Well, you do not have to turn to the prosecutor's office to size up the legal substance of the legislative committee's decision. This is an indirect-action document and cannot have legal force, much less the force of law. It was destined for just three destinations: The Russian Ministry of Education, the State Committee for Science, and the legislative committee for public education.

There has been the usual leak of information and a fourth copy of the decision, which also did the rounds in Russia, has surfaced.

"I voted for the idea," Smirnov said. "I myself do not like either the document's tone or its style. If had written it myself, I would have done it quite differently. But people want resolute action. They voted in favor of literally every word. The guys at the committee are all young and ardent; besides, they're all committed to different parties. Apart from me, there is just one communist."

The expulsion was worded as follows" "CPSU Member S.A. Smirnov is to be expelled from the party for actions contravening the party's principled position in the sphere of public education and for violating citizens' political rights and freedoms."

Smirnov was charged with attempting to introduce a professional ban on communist teachers. Well, with its decision the Central Control Commission is to all intents and purposes now introducing a professional ban on a communist legislator.

He still has not decided whether to appeal or not. Possibly because he does not reckon himself to be a member of the Russian Communist Party. He has, however, paid his party dues for March. A week after he was expelled....

He was expelled on the eve of the plenum where I.K. Polozkov announced a purge [chistka] in the party.

The purge has begun.

A precedent has been established.

The chairman of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Control Commission has been tasked with discussing the question of departyization with CPSU Members E.D. Dneprov, minister of education, and N.G. Malyshev, chairman of the State Committee for Affairs of Science and Higher Schooling.

Who will be next?

Dzasokhov: Time Not Right for Party Debate

PM2203160791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Mar 91 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Confrontation or Dialogue?"]

[Text] Now is not the time to get drawn into an internal party discussion. That idea was expressed 20 March by A.S. Dzasokhov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in a speech at a conference of communists at the P. Lumumba University of Friendship of the Peoples.

In his words, there are many views about the Communist Party's activity during the transition from a unitary state to a federal state and from strict centralized economic management to market relations. In particular, some people are proposing turning it into a legislative-type party, and others want to change its name and reform it in a social democratic direction. Stressing that this is not the time for the CPSU to be resolving these issues, he explained this by saying that there are hard times ahead, not least in connection with the measures taken by the country's leadership in the sphere of pricing.

The secretary of the CPSU Central Committee dwelt on questions of cooperation with other social formations. He noted that just five months ago there was an opportunity for a wide-ranging dialogue. But now the struggle with political opponents has become severe. Certain forces are no longer keeping within the "broad bounds of the democratic process." Despite this, however, the CPSU is inclined to engage in constructive collaboration.

Politburo's Shenin on Communist Party

PM1903142191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Mar 91 First Edition p 4

[Interview with O.S. Shenin, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, by unidentified correspondent; place and date not given: "Not Losing Political Initiative"]

[Text] [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Oleg Semenovich, do not be surprised that we want to begin this interview with a personal element, so to speak. People's perception has changed fundamentally—in an interlocutor readers want to see a living man, not simply an official. So tell us at least briefly what your career has been, what your credo in life is, what your family is like, how your ordinary working day proceeds, and what you do in your free time.

[Shenin] My life took shape in the same way as many of my contemporaries: school, then study in a technical college, work and parallel study at an institute. It was the time of the big construction sites in Siberia so my choice of the construction worker's profession was no accident. Incidentally, that was also the choice of my son, my elder daughter, and my wife. To be frank it was all complicated: working and studying, first in the institute and then at the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences, raising three children, changing our place of residence frequently. But I believe the difficulties also helped to develop specific character traits. I like order and precision in everything, beginning with business and ending with external appearances, I do not respect laxity or arrogance in people, I try myself to be open and I value that quality in a person.

I came to full-time party work in 1974, already at a mature age, from the post of manager of a large construct trust. At that time, the party organizations engaged in earnest and directly in economic questions. I, too, had to engage in them when I worked as first secretary of the Achinsk Gorkom [city committee], secretary of the Khakass Obkom [oblast committee], and secretary of the Krasnoyarsk CPSU Kraykom [kray committee]. But to be honest I was most attracted by organizational work. As a production worker I always strove to act through

people, and party work is in principle inconceivable without that. That is why I am sincerely satisfied that in the CPSU Central Committee Politburo I have been instructed to manage organizational matters, including questions of the work of the military party organizations.

Party work has frequently brought me and our armed forces together. I had occasion to familiarize myself closely with the concerns which perturb Soviet servicemen not in the quiet of an office but in real life. Including in the most extreme combat conditions of all, during my work in Afghanistan in 1980-1981.

What else about myself? If we are speaking of my working day, as a rule it is from 0830 hours to 2200 and is filled with meetings and talks with people, work with documents, answers to communists' letters and appeals. So that nowadays, however much I want to, I very rarely have occasion to see a new show or listen to an opera or good concert.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Naturally we have come to your present party concerns. Here, it seems to us, is one of them. A certain contradiction is obvious: General party documents emphasize the activation of the grassroots party organizations, but from below numerous complaints are being leveled against the higher-ranking party committees including and perhaps most of all the CPSU Central Committee. You often hear complaints that no assertiveness is to be seen in ideology, that theory is "keeping quiet," that attacks against the CPSU are not being properly rebuffed. What is the matter here, in your opinion?

[Shenin] The contradiction you have cited is a contradiction of life as it exists. It reflects the numerous and diverse difficulties attending the CPSU's transformation into an actual political party. We can still feel the syndrome of waiting for directives on virtually every question. Correspondingly the sharp, sometimes destructive criticism coming from the localities and addressed to the CPSU Central Committee. The Central Committee indeed does not always keep abreast of events, sometimes leaving communists in ignorance for a long time with regard to the stance it takes on a particular fundamental issue of social development. But, one cannot fail to see too the positive advances in the Central Committee's work. Now on all urgent questions the Central Committee, Politburo, and CPSU Central Committee Secretariat seek to promptly voice their position and to steer the party organizations and party members.

At the same time, you rightly drew attention not only to information work. We need the efforts of science, coordinated collaboration between representatives of a whole series of modern social disciplines and party research centers. Only then will the CPSU be able to scientifically back up all aspects of its activity. We are now acting in this direction, galvanizing work on the draft of the new CPSU Program and restructuring the activity of party training and scientific institutions.

Alongside other questions, in my view questions of the party's work in the Armed Forces are today also in need of serious theoretical elaboration. In the present situation you cannot make do with old approaches and formulas. The 28th CPSU Congress resolution on military policy serves as the initial methodological base for this work. The Central Committee is now coordinating practical work on the perestroyka of party structures in the Armed Forces and border, internal, and railroad troops. The report and election campaign is now under way and on 29-30 March there will be the first all-Army party conference, which will be an important stage in the completion of the radical perestroyka of the entire system of party-political work which is being implemented within the framework of the military reform. All this, as you can understand, is only the start of a large amount of work.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] The party is being renewed—of that there is no doubt. But many people believe that the process is proceeding slowly.... What could you say on that subject?

[Shenin] I think that in the widespread complaints of the slowness and poor results of the party's perestroyka it is largely political maximalism which is to blame—that latter-day relapse into the "infantile disorder of Leftism in communism" which Lenin once analyzed. The present-day realities of the CPSU, for all the difficulties it is experiencing, give no grounds for pessimism. Our most implacable political foes are noting not without annoyance the intensification of the activeness of many party organizations and the growth of the CPSU's prestige as a whole.

The CPSU's prestige is also still high in the army. That is borne out in particular by the dynamics of the admission of new members to the party, by the support of its policy by the majority of Armed Forces personnel. That instills the hope that the Army communists will not succumb to the onslaught of destructive forces.

There should undoubtedly be a change to the stance of a number of local party organs, which have virtually removed themselves from participation in the solution of the Army's social problems and from the protection of servicemen's vital interests, honor, and dignity. It seems to me that the contribution of communists who are legislators to the formation of the legal basis of the Armed Forces' functioning could also be more substantial.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] The multiparty system has become a reality. Antisocialist, neobourgeois trends are probably also emerging. That is what is emerging is obviously not "peaceful pluralism." In your view, what should be the content of the communists' ability to wage a political struggle under the conditions of tough pressure and shameless social demagoguery from the destructive forces seeking power by any means?

[Shenin] Much has been said about the work of the party in unaccustomed conditions without the former political

comfort. I shall not repeat it. I shall merely stress what are in my view the most important and absolutely compulsory prerequisites for success in work to implement the CPSU's line toward the consolidation of society and cooperation among all forces of perestroyka.

All party committees from top to bottom and all communists without exception must put an end to the feelings of self-gnawing [samoyedstvo], so to speak, and self-flagellation in their milieu which give rise to the paralysis of political will and a complex of guilt for all the failings, errors, and crimes of the past. Yet, at the same time, they must abandon the sense of their own superiority, their own infallibility inherited by some party members from that past and abandon the conviction that any word of ours, any decision is the ultimate truth.

But readiness for compromise by no means signifies the renunciation of principles or ideological apostasy. It is in the ability to define frontiers and the political and social price of the concessions made to consolidate society and guarantee its normal development that the party's maturity and its mastery of the art of waging the political struggle are checked.

The key element and decisive condition for success in the political struggle is the ability to win over the masses. That cannot be achieved with the aid of oratorical skill alone. In this connection it is appropriate to stress that the Central Committee of our party categorically rejects populism. Populist slogans are now current among many critics of the CPSU.

We do not have the right to flirt with the people. We must honestly explain to people that initially attractive populist slogans call society to chaos, to mob rule, to totalitarianism. But in no way to democracy.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] As a member of the Politburo you are in charge of questions of organizational-party work and cadres policy. You hear people say: Where have all the bright individuals gone—the party theorists, the skilled polemicists who are in such short supply, the exceptional organizers? You form the impression that party science cannot give us arguments and organizers cannot offer us powerful options for action. Or is that not the case? In general, how does the Central Committee assess the cadres situation in the party, how is cadres policy formed at present?

[Shenin] Complaints about the shortage of bright, talented individuals in the party will probably be heard tomorrow and the day after tomorrow. However many such people may join active political life at a given moment, there will always be too few of them. At the same time, I think no one can dispute the fact that perestroyka has promoted to the first roles in various party organizations and in the party as a whole many truly bright and unique individuals. Together with the democratic renewal of party structures and forms and methods of party work the party cadres are also being renewed, and very rapidly at that. Today in their majority they are honest, educated, competent workers who enjoy the respect of those around them. Are they all without a mote in their eye, so to speak? I do not think so. No one has yet succeeded in creating a "cadres incubator" for the reproduction of workers with set positive characteristics. It would be simply wrong to set the task in that way.

Nor do we make a secret of the fact that at drastic turning points of perestroyka we have lost some of our interesting and original people. Unfortunately, some lacked the political courage and moral strength to withstand the harsh moral pressure to which communists and the CPSU as a whole have been subjected recently. Despite the substantial changes in cadres work, the Central Committee is not satisfied with its standard and results. The problems which exist here are being carefully analyzed in order to draw practical conclusions.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] One more question connected with problems of the CPSU's activeness. Recently the pages of the "independent press" have been bristling with reports about the activity of various fronts, parties, and associations.... They are holding meetings and protest demonstrations, and sending couriers to various parts of the country. A very broad spectrum—from opposing the referendum on the fate of the USSR to kindling separatist sentiments, from trying to organize a trial of the CPSU to launching massive attacks on public awareness in order to boost the reputation of their own leader. Recently Comrade B. Yeltsin called for a powerful party to be cobbled together from the "democratic forces...."

How, in this frankly extraordinary situation, can the Communist Party avoid losing the political initiative?

[Shenin] Indeed, recently a noisy and strident campaign has been launched primarily against the USSR President, the Cabinet of Ministers, and the USSR Supreme Soviet and also against the CPSU and its organizations and press organs.

If, discarding the verbal trumpery of which a lot is being disgorged, we take a more attentive look at what the initiators and active participants of the campaign are opposing, we may easily be convinced that the main target is the recent measures taken by the central organs of power of the USSR aimed at stabilizing the situation, setting up a normal economic life for the country, preserving its unity, and enabling people to look confidently into the future. The thought involuntarily arises that some people are frightened by the implementation of these measures, by the fact that the situation of uncertainty and confusion will soon recede into the past, and they have still not succeeded in realizing their political and material ambitions. It is characteristic that particular activeness is being displayed by those who have already shown their inability to act constructively within the framework of the constitution and the laws of the country. That is under conditions where the law rules. It is they who are raging, trying to delay the

changes they do not like, attempting again to arouse society, to fuel confrontation, to impose the "image of the enemy."

Here all means are brought into play, including frenzied anticommunist hysteria. The fact that the CPSU adopts a clear stance comprehensible to all in no way suits the right-wing radicals who for some reason call themselves "left-wing democrats." They do not like the fact that it advocates the renewal of our society on condition that the working people's most important social gains are preserved, that it advocates the intensification of the social protection of the population and the preservation of our country's unity. They are frankly frightened that the party is joining in social life more actively, that its voice is becoming increasingly strong, including in soviets of all levels, and that its policy is increasingly finding a response among people. For the radicals this is especially unpleasant because they themselves, because of their inability to propose and pursue a constructive policy, are increasingly losing the population's trust.

How should communists act under these conditions? Primarily they must prove the correctness of the CPSU's course by word and deed, be vigorous, enterprising expressers of the party's policy under the specific conditions of their activity, enlist as many people as possible to their side, and seek agreement with them on fundamental questions of life. The all-Union referendum is now to the fore. It is a case of the fate of the country and the state, the fate of millions of people. We must be clearly aware that the attempt to destroy the ties and interweavings of peoples, economies, and cultures formed over the centuries in our enormous state will have catastrophic consequences and will aggravate extraordinarily the territorial, national, and economic problems. We have already seen that in the examples of Nagorno-Karabakh, Georgia, Moldova, and the Baltic republics. People are dying, hundreds of thousands of refugees are appearing in peace time, and the economy and culture are being devastated. The CPSU unambiguously advocates a firm, renewed Union of republics and urges the entire population to express itself in favor of this during the referendum. We urge them to say "YES" to the Union, "YES" to confidence in the future, "YES" to the possibility to live and work in peace. The CPSU is resolutely opposed to the newfound rulers preventing people from expressing their attitude toward a question of vital importance for them.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] As is well known up to 10 platforms, avenues, and movements are operating within the CPSU. The "Unity" group of Leningrad Communists intend to convene the 20th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party (of Bolsheviks) with a view to reviving a party of the Stalinist model.... Does the danger of a split not threaten the CPSU? In your view how can it be averted?

[Shenin] I think that it would be a tragic error for the party now to focus attention on internal party problems and on ascertaining who is more principled than whom. Incidentally, we are being pushed very persistently toward this by our political foes and opponents, who understand very well that a party engaged only in its own internal affairs is doomed. It ceases to be necessary to people. The overwhelming majority of communists understand the situation correctly and are prepared for sensible compromise in order to ensure unity of actions in implementing the party policy elaborated by the 28th congress and given specific form in the decisions of subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums.

As you know, before the congress there was a very great deal of talk about a split. A group of renegades left the party, and where are they now? Some have disappeared completely from the political horizon, while the very logic of political life has hurled others into the ranks of the violent anticommunists where they are obliged constantly to disgorge floods of filth and slander against the party which used to be theirs in order to convince people of the "objectivity" of their political somersault. All this looks very unseemly and indecent, to put it mildly.

What was said about the unity of actions is also true of the cadres potential of the Armed Forces, which have now been involved in profound democratic transformations. Whatever process we take—the reduction of the army, the withdrawal of troops from East Europe, or the reform of the political organs—particular people and specific individuals stand behind all this. The fact that in the critical situation in which our society has found itself this process is proceeding in the Armed Forces without social and political upheavals says a lot. Primarily it speaks of the maturity of the military cadres and, I would stress this particularly, their civic courage.

Internal Troops Party Conference Held

PM2603103091 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 23 Mar 91 First Edition p 1

[S. Shevtsov report: "Out on Call. Conference of USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Internal Troops CPSU Organizations Held"]

[Text] Every time the frozen stillness of the night beyond the windows of the "Ossetia" tourist center was broken by the echo of submachine-gun rounds and the orderly's voice roused the company "to arms!", I listened intently to the receding tramp of boots and caught myself thinking with an eerie sensation that all of them, these 18-year-old lads, were going off to fight right now. Some of them might not return.

During a recent 10-day trip to Tskhinvali I got to know them through and through. Like brothers we shared the stale blockade bread, escorted convoys carrying fuel, flour, and medicines through checkpoints manned by motley fighters, and transported refugees out of ravaged and bombarded villages.... Captain Vladimir Kostenevich, the marvelously cheerful special purpose company commander who had gone through fire and water; his deputy commander for political affairs, the severe and sober-minded Senior Lieutenant Akir Mirzoyev; the

wonderful comrade and stern Sergeant Anton Zaytsev; and the two-meter-tall strapping guy Private Saulius Paulauskas, reasonable in everything he said and did.

It seems to me that I shall never forget these people and dozens, indeed hundreds of other officers and soldiers whom I met in South Ossetia and other "hot spots" in the country.

I could not help remembering this when at the first Conference of USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] Internal Troops CPSU Organizations I met with many of the servicemen I had got to know in Tskhinvali, Dushanbe, Baku, Namangan.... I know how heavy the burden is that has been lying on the shoulders of the law and order troops for a long time now. Only last year in regions in which a state of emergency had been declared, internal troops servicemen arrested 140,000 lawbreakers and approximately 2,500 criminals, and confiscated over 7,000 weapons, 1.5 million rounds of ammunition, and almost 1,000 explosive devices.

Unfortunately, we have already gotten used to statistics of this sort. But, behind the bare figures is the courage and great fortitude of these people, soldiers and officers, communists and nonparty members, who do their job practically without respite in emergency conditions. In the course of carrying out their duty 29 internal troops servicemen have been killed, approximately 100 have been wounded, and over 450 have suffered injuries. Among those whose lives have been cut short by bandits' bullets are the Communists V. Chekmarev, P. Tereshchenko, V. Grigoryev....

In these extremely difficult conditions party organizations and communists have in practice proved to be the vanguard, the cementing base of units and subunits, the caring comrades of soldiers and sergeants. They take the execution of the most difficult and deadly tasks upon themselves, confirming by action the most indisputable truth: The trust of the masses is won not by words, not by loud appeals at noisy rallies, but by concrete work. This was what Lieutenant General A.I. Griyenko, chairman of the troops' organizational committee for the party organs' reports and elections and chief of the USSR MVD Internal Troops Military-Political Administration, said in his report at the conference.

The dialogue at the conference was heated and heartfelt. During the recesses I talked with some delegates. About the problems they had come to the conference with. For example, Lieutenant Colonel Sh. Zabirov, secretary of the Urals troops party committee, was worried by the results of the referendum: Only 80.3 percent of servicemen in the Urals had voted for a united Union. This result was somewhat unexpected for communists in the troops.

But, nevertheless, it seemed to me that communists in the troops are in fighting mood. At their first conference they completed the establishment of an autonomous CPSU organization structure in the troops and the division of functions between state and party bodies. The communists in the troops spoke in favor of cooperation and a "debating struggle" with representatives of other political parties and tendencies which are already appearing in subunits, and also worked out the conceptual basis of the party organization's activity and elected a troops party committee and control commission.

"Communists, soldiers, and officers of the internal troops constantly find themselves in difficult, emergency conditions," USSR Internal Affairs Minister B.K. Pugo told me as he shared his impressions of the conference, "and nobody can reproach them with carrying out their duty in a lackadaisical manner. They bear a particularly important load on their shoulders. So, in my opinion, society is currently indebted to these people."

Border Guard CPSU Organizations Hold Conference

PM2703142191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Mar 91 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "USSR KGB Border Troops' Party Conference"]

[Text] The first conference of the USSR KGB Border Troops' CPSU organizations was held in Moscow 26 March.

The conference approved the regulation on the control commission and elected the party committee and control commission for the USSR KGB border troops' party organization.

The delegates were addressed by O.S. Shenin, Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary, L.V. Sharin, acting chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Defense and Security Questions [title of body as published], took part in the conference's work.

Increased Disobedience Toward Moscow Police Noted

LD2603074691 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0600 GMT 26 Mar 91

[Text] In an interview with POSTFAKTUM agency, Militia Major General (Belyanskiy), deputy head of the chief administration of internal affairs of the executive committee [title as heard] speaking of the situation in Moscow city, pointed out that passions are now heated. Judge for yourself, because on 25 March several meetings were held in the city, in which a total of more than 1 million people took part. This is twice as many as in the same period of 1990. Cases of disobedience toward milita officials are becoming more frequent. The militia, for its part, tries to do everything it can to ensure order and calm in Moscow streets.

Supreme Court Head on Problems in USSR Courts

LD2603184991 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 26 Mar 91

[Interview with Ye. A. Smolentsev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Court, with correspondent V. Bakarinov, in Moscow on 26 March; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] A scientific and practical conference entitled "Problems of Court powers in the USSR" opened in Moscow today.

[Bakarinov] There are many problems connected with courts, but on the other hand there are many in every sphere. What is important is the wish to tackle these problems and the readiness to implement this desire.

There is no image of the goddess of justice on the pediments of Soviet courts, there are some emblems or at least shields and swords. Is this the reason for the topic of today's conference?

[Smolentsev] Our society has arrived at the understanding that we need to have a truely law-governed state, based on two essential principles: the principle of lawfulness and the principle of dividing authority into legislative, executive and juridical powers. At the same time, juridical powers must essentially be a guarantor of the legality, it must defend the interests of a specific individual above all and his lawful rights and interests.

[Bakarinov] People speak a lot either about the excessive leniency of the courts or about their excessive strictness. Tell me please, what is your attitude to the inevitability of criminal punishment?

[Smolentsev] If, for example, we take last year. A total of 2,000,700 crimes were registered then, and only half of them 1,100,000 crimes were solved and brought to account. The worst thing is when punishment is not inflicted on an individual. This encourages him to commit new and more serious crimes.

[Bakarinov] Why do the law-enforcement bodies accuse you of turning down a large number of proceedings?

[Smolentsev] I sense a hidden meaning behind this question. It is true that there are many such cases. Every year there are approximately 60,000-70,000 cases of individuals who have committed crime which are returning by the courts to the bodies of preliminary investigation to conduct additional investigations. The thing is that if there is no evidence and no complete certainty that it was he who committed the crime, there cannot be a guilty verdict.

[Bakarinov] How do you see the role of a modern judge in a modern law-governed state?

[Smolentsev] Above all, he must be a person who is professionally well-prepared. He must be a person who is sensitive to other people. He must be a person who possesses such moral qualities that he has not just a formal but also a moral right to judge other people.

MVD Official Reports Huge Growth in Crime

LD2603161191 Moscow TASS in English 1550 GMT 26 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Borisov]

[Text] Moscow Mar 26 TASS—A transition of the USSR national economy to market relations is accompanied by growth of crime, believes General Boris Voronov, head of the main agency for prophylactic service of the USSR Interior Ministry.

He told a news conference here today that as compared with the seventies the number of registered crimes in the USSR almost tripled in 1990 to reach nearly 2.8 million.

Voronov said that the tendency for the growth of mercenary crimes is clearly seen. Thus the number of large thefts solved last year increased by 20 percent. The total sum of material damage resulting from stealth of state and public property reached nearly 88 million roubles and of individual property 184 million roubles.

Justifiable concern is caused by the fact that the criminogenic base widens with the increase of the number of unemployed and vagrants (particularly among refugees and youths). According to the estimate of the USSR Interior Ministry, some eight million people are not employed in socially useful work in the USSR at present.

With a transition to market relations the number of jobs will annually decrease by one million jobs on an average, which will inevitably be related with crime growth.

Voronov believes that the situation with crime will be particularly acute among minors. Alongside traditional causes leading to teenagers' criminal offenses, such as the unfavourable situation in families, drunkenness and drug addiction, new causes will appear. Teenagers, including criminal offenders, are ever more often denied employment. In 1990 alone the crime rate among adolescents not engaged in socially useful labour grew by eight percent.

Economic

Four Dnepropetrovsk Mines on Strike

LD2603152791 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1400 GMT 26 Mar 91

[Text] Four out of 11 mines of the Pavlogradugol association continue to strike today, reports our correspondent from Dnepropetrovsk Oblast. The direct losses inflicted here by the strike amount to 36 million rubles. The administration and the strike committee have been issued a decision of the oblast court declaring the strike illegal. The fact is that in the pre-strike period, the miners did not forward to the administration a package

with their demands. The miners explain their actions by the fact that the strike is a continuation of the summer strike of 1989.

Donetsk Miners Appeal for Support

LD2603142191 Kiev International Service in English 0000 GMT 26 Mar 91

[Text] A meeting of striking miners was held in the city of Donetsk. The miners appealed to the residents of the city to support their actions. In the meantime, the situation in the metallurgical industry is becoming more and more tense. Eight blast furnaces at the Zaporizhstal, Krivorizhstal, and metallurigical plants in Dnepropetrovsk, Denprodzerzhinsk, Mariupol, and other cities have stopped their work.

No Compensation Planned for Non-State Bank Funds

LD2603162791 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1400 GMT 26 Mar 91

[Text] The rise in retail prices starting on 2 April will be partly compensated for by the 40 percent addition to bank deposits and to the value of the securities issued by state and savings banks of the USSR. For people who have entrusted their savings to other banking establishments, this point in the decree of the USSR president is not extended to them. According to the opinion of (Osterson), chairman of the Bank of Estonia, further resolutions on this matter are needed as far as that republic is concerned. The customers of the Bank of Estonia, as well as a number of other independent credit establishments of the republic, may be left without the monetary compensation that is envisaged during the forthcoming price reform in the USSR.

Private Control of Retail Trade Said Increasing

LD2603094691 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 26 Mar 91

[Text] The president of the Soviet leaseholders and entrepreneurs' union, Pavel Bunich, has said private citizens and labor staffs were successfully moving in to control retail trade facilities. Twenty percent of Soviet stores, cafeterias, and restaurants had already changed hands, he said, and twice as many were about to follow. The economist insisted the new owners had a lead over state managers in operating in conditions of a free market economy. Even now that the country was undergoing a profound economic crisis, he said, stores under new management could offer customers a better assortment of goods.

Planning Chairman Warns of Economic Problems

LD2503233191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 25 Mar 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] As you know the budget of our country has recently been adopted. Implementing it is posing a number of problems and questions demanding immediate solutions.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent Stepanyuk] The price reform, discussion of the Union treaty, and the referendum have somehow recently pushed into the background the no less important problem of the country's budget. Viktor Grigoriyevich, is some stabilization expected here, is there any hope?

[Kucherenko, chairman of the Planning, Finance and Budget Commission of the USSR Supreme Soviet] Well, an exceptionally complex situation is arising in the Union budget, and in my opinion, so far there are no prerequisites for stabilization visible. Just the opposite; even I am getting the impression that a sort of financial and economic stifling of the Union is going on.

You remember the work and effort we put into forming the budget for 1991. We dragged it out almost up to January this year, waiting for there to be an economic agreement between the republics which would determine which state structures would be financed from the Union budget and which structures would be financed in the republics, from which sources and in what amount contributions to the budget would come to the Union budget, and which would remain in the localities for the local soviets and republics.

But now individual heads of banks and financial bodies have cut off contributions to the Union budget of their own volition. You will realize that a situation has arisen when the structures that were put under the Union budget—programs, science, even social, cultural, and consumer items, the Army, the border guards, and so on and so forth—they found themselves in a situation where there was no finance for them in the first quarter.

According to the plan we should have received 26 billion rubles [R] in the first quarter—not in the first quarter, in the first two months—36 billion, I mean, but so far we have received 13 billion. What are we to do? Well, for the moment the Ministry of Finance has taken up to R10 billion on credit in the bank for that period at a rate of 7 percent, and now 1 April is approaching and we have to pay back these debts, or else the rate will go up to 15 percent. In other words a most extreme situation is building up. I am perfectly aware that this money remains in the republic with the local soviets, where incidentally, profits taxes have grown by 2.3 times in the republics. In the local soviets the contributions [otchisleniye] have doubled. The profits tax paid into the Union budget has decreased by 72 percent. I realize that the local soviets do not have any spare money. In general, you know, there is never a lot of money here, it is always little, and it is always possible to find ways to use it.

But a most extreme situation is building up. Money appears in the localities. This money is put into action as an extra, financing some kind of works. Naturally it goes

partly too for wages. At the same time we cannot stop financing the Army, the border troops, science—which is estimated to need 14-16 billion—from the Union budget and what happens is that here in this country two streams of one and the same money collide: There are no resources backing them up—the money given out in the localities and that obliged as credit to finance the Union budget.

Well, it is very difficult to imagine a greater sabotage in the country. If everything goes on like this for half a year, almost R120 billion will end up on the consumer market. I have estimated that the destructive force of such a situation can only be compared with the earthquake in Armenia, if it takes place in the entire country, and if it goes slowly—not momentarily, but during the whole year.

[Stepanyuk] What is the way out of this situation, Viktor Grigoryevich?

[Kucherenko] The way out is as follows. It is necessary to examine this question at the session of the Supreme Soviet, and it has already been included in the agenda of the fourth session—but that will happen sometime in mid-April. As for now, we have reported the situation to the president. The president issued instructions to prepare proposals for a way out of this situation. We have prepared such proposals together with the Minister of Finance and with the chairman of the USSR State Bank, and submitted them to him, and we believe that there is a need to urgently convene the Federation Council, which is to determine whether its decisions are recognized and being fulfilled or not fulfilled in the republics. Otherwise other people may reject them of their own accord and as they think fit.

It is necessary that those people who violate Soviet laws currently in force be removed from their work because the situation that is coming about is very serious and dramatic, and in this sense the country should not be put at risk. It is necessary that in the first quarter expenditure and revenues are formed as was laid out by the economic agreement and by the decision adopted when we were adopting the budget. And I believe, a number of other measures...[changes thought] Only a cluster of similar measures can reinforce the people's opinion, which was expressed at the referendum as being in favor of preserving our Union. [end recording]

World Bank Welcomes USSR Membership

LD2203101591 Moscow TASS in English 0846 GMT 22 Mar 91

[Text] Copenhagen March 22 TASS—Visiting World Bank President Barber Conable said at a news conference here on Thursday that the World Bank would welcome the Soviet Union's application to admit it to this body. He emphasised that the USSR would be admitted to the World Bank although other members' contributions would have to be diminished because of this.

The World Bank is known to possess a fixed fund and the size of credits extended to its members depends on their share in the overall capital.

One hundred and fifty five states are members of the bank. Credits worth a total of some 20 billion U.S. dollars are annually extended only to developing countries. Although most of the credits are granted at world prime lending rates, exceptions are made for the poorest countries.

Conable said Eastern Europe was now the main "target" of the bank's activity. Some 100 million U.S. dollars were extended annually to this region two years ago. This sum now increases to three billion and is expected to grow still more, since Bulgaria, too, has joined the bank recently. Romania also applied for admittance.

Conable thinks that living standards in East European countries are the lowest in Europe and the per capita income will continue to go down before changes that are being carried out there will yield the first tangible results.

Metallurgy's 'Catastrophic Situation' Described

PM2603123591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Mar 91 Second Edition p 1

[Report by Yu. Medvedev: "Metallurgy Enterprises on the Brink of Stoppage. Why?"]

[Text] As was to be expected, the miners' strikes have produced a chain reaction of complications in the national economy's partner sectors. Primarily for metallurgy workers. The editorial office receives alarming reports from enterprise collectives from Cherepovets, Chelyabinsk, Lipetsk, Donetsk, the Dnieper region, and several other regions.

Today's situation in the metallurgical industry was described to PRAVDA's correspondent by L. Radyukevich, USSR first deputy minister of metallurgy:

The miners' strike this March has placed the country's metallurgy enterprises in a catastrophic situation. For their part, metallurgy workers are letting down their own partners in industrial sectors.

Given the daily consumption norm of 346,000 tonnes of coking coal, delivery shortfalls since the beginning of the months now stand at 1.552 million tonnes. Overall technological stocks have dropped to 0.7 million tonnes against the norm of 2.3 million tonnes. Export deliveries of furnace charge have ceased due to coal shortages. Virtually all coking batteries have been slowed down, with a daily loss of up to 50,000 tonnes of output. Nineteen out of 123 blast furnaces have been shut down. The remaining are also working at a sluggish pace.

Deliveries of foundry coke and cast iron to machine-building enterprises have almost completely ceased. Only 50-60 percent of coke is supplied for the production of nickel, copper, yellow phosphorus which is the main component in the production of all detergents in the

country, caustic and calcinated soda, and sugar. The shutdown of, or reduced output by, blast and shaft furnaces has resulted in reduced deliveries of fuel, blast furnace casing-head gas, and steam for heating cities and housing settlements.

The thwarting of contracted volumes of commodity output and of contractual commitments for deliveries of metal products due to reduced coke production and the coke's poorer quality are leaving the millions-strong collective of metallurgy workers without funds, including funds for wage payments and the social sphere's development.

Operations by coking batteries in emergency conditions threaten to destroy the fireproof lining. This resulted in the loss of capacities for the production of 3.5 million tonnes of coke in 1990. Unless coking industry workers receive coal within the next few days, current losses may be several times greater. The restoration of capacities for the production of 1 million tonnes of output requires 40 million rubles, more than 15,000 tonnes of scarce fire-resistant materials, and a period of two years.

Agricultural

Stroyev Attends Livestock Feed Institute Seminar

PM2503144191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Mar 91 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "All-Union Seminar"]

[Text] Against the background of the general food scarcity in the country, the shortage of livestock products is being deeply felt. This is because, despite huge supplies, many collective and state farms now have practically nothing with which to feed their livestock. Participants in the All-Union Seminar spoke of this during the meeting at the Vilyams All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Feed near Moscow on 22 March.

Ye.S. Stroyev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, participated in the work of the seminar.

Urgency of Spring Field Work Stressed

914B0125B Moscow TRUD in Russian 21 Mar 91 p 1

[Article by V. Shchurov under the "Timely Topic" rubric: "What Will We Sow, Farmers?"]

[Text] Weeks and months pass implacably, although this is perhaps less noticeable than ever. With the endless legislative debates, the rallies, and the strikes, spring has somehow arrived unnoticed. Whether we want to, the time has come to concern ourselves with our daily bread for the long year to come. Bearing this in mind, last week Prime Minister V. Pavlov outlined a tactical mission: The country must sow in order to live.

This was pronounced at a session of the Cabinet of Ministers that discussed preparations for the spring field work. Properly speaking, work has already begun in the south of the country, but in the main grain-producing regions, there is still time before the sowing. It will begin a week and a half later than the usual date. If we consider that the winter grains survived the frosts well and that there is moisture in the earth, then we should not be complaining about the weather. We should use the opportunity given to us by nature to get ourselves ready on time.

This matter, I will say right off, is extremely difficult. The leaders of the agro-industrial complex of the country and the republics have all been complaining of problems with deliveries and supply, as a result of which the farms' readiness for the sowing is lower than it was one year ago. That is not surprising: With a universal decline in discipline and the rupture of the usual ties, it is to be expected that the agricultural sector would be affected. Nonetheless, one is struck by the scale of what has not been delivered to the countryside. For example, last year Russian kolkhozes and sovkhozes did not receive 32,000 tractors, and the debt of the builders of machines has "risen" by another 3,800 this year. The agricultural industry has been shorted hundreds of thousands of tons of fuel and diesel, and Agrokhim does not have enough fertilizers because of stoppages at a number of its factories.

But this kind of problem is old news: It is impossible to recall a spring when the countryside did not have supply problems. But this spring's work is special in that it still needs to pay on autumn's accounts. The harvest of last year's generous grain crops lasted too long: The workers did not have time to finish sowing winter crops on 4 million hectares, and they did not plow almost 20 million hectares for winter fallow. According to the USSR Ministry of Agriculture, the volume of spring field work must be 25-30 percent greater than usual. This must take place in the same short time period as usual if we wish to have bread, potatoes, vegetables, and feed for the private farms.

The new administration is counting on untying this "Gordian knot" using familiar administrative methods. For example, a ruling on the broad-scale enlistment of city dwellers for the sowing and harvest has already been adopted. It has been proposed that the local organs of government immediately organize among the owners of personal plots the purchase of the missing potatoes for planting on the fields of the kolkhozes. Enterprises that build agricultural machines have been given the task of setting up production of spare parts for equipment purchased in former socialist countries with whom partnership ties have been lost. Hard-to-get foreign currency has also been found for purchasing polyethylene sheeting and pesticides. Everything is being done quickly and under emergency conditions, either out of habit or because we simply do not know how to work any other way.

In general it is possible to have differing opinions about administrative methods, but one cannot help but acknowledge that there is no possibility of doing without them entirely. With the monopolism that remains in force, governmental directives are the only way to force our "partners" to work in the countryside. Under traditional forms of organization of labor in the agricultural industry, as bitter experience shows, our countryside does not have the means to handle the times of rush work without city dwellers. Nonetheless, it must also be recognized that equipment, fertilizer, and outside help are not the most important factors. The success of the sowing also depends first and foremost on the peasant and his interest in the harvest.

Judging by everything, this is today's impasse, which no directives or appeals can break. At the cabinet session the representatives of the Ministries of Agriculture of a number of the republics reported that a tendency to reduce the sowing of vegetables, potatoes, and especially grain crops had been noted. In Kazakhstan, for example, the kolkhozes and sovkhozes have presented a sowing plan which proposes to reduce the spring crop area by 1 million hectares. The administration demanded that the area sown with grain crops be restored. It is difficult to say how this "tug-of-war," which incidentally is characteristic of many agricultural regions, will end. But it is a fact that the country's already meager grain balance on the eve of the spring sowing is threatened, as is the purchase of potatoes, fruits, and vegetables. Only one-fourth of the planned volume of forward contracting agreements for these farm goods has been concluded.

The reason is already well known. The autumn increase in purchase prices no longer stimulates the cultivation of agricultural production so far as it was completely "eaten up" by the recent cost increases in construction and material and technical resources. In the words of F. Mirochitskiy, Belorussian minister of agriculture, the republic's agro-industrial complex is headed for financial ruin. In the Russian Government they have calculated that the scissors of the new prices will "cut away" two-thirds of planned profits from the budgets of kolkhozes and sovkhozes. So we have the economic paradox of the moment: The less grain you sow, the less the risk of bankruptcy. The governments, which do not have material incentives in their arsenal, have only methods of methods of compulsion remaining to them.

But prices in our country, as everyone knows, are also under the control of the government: The government establishes them, and the government can replace them with new ones. Incidentally, recently the prime minister gave instructions to find out why, despite reforms, the agricultural industry and many of its partners are no better off than before. One would like to believe that the defects will be corrected. But is there enough time? For the time being the plans are made up reckoning on today's "unprofitable" purchase prices.

Nonetheless, the situation is not hopeless. If only because the new Cabinet of Ministers has clearly taken a "pro-agricultural position," requiring that in the coming weeks partners catch up on deliveries to the village of equipment, fertilizers, and fuel. As for the peasants themselves, let us be frank: This is not the first year they have been motivated not so much by a shaky economic interest as by the logic of life. And life's logic really does demand that one sow in order to live. We will add that tens of thousands of private farmers and leaseholders are going out into the fields this year, and their fate depends entirely on the harvest. By decision of the governments of a number of the republics, all willing city dwellers are being allotted plots of land. And we have the right to expect a substantial augmentation of vegetables and potatoes on our table from truck farms.

Regarding the public fields, it is more difficult to make predictions. Most likely we can expect a nervous sowing campaign and another painfully familiar "battle for the harvest." With an economically depressed and depopulated countryside, one should not count on any other result. We should acknowledge this honestly and together take on our shoulders the burden of agricultural cares without worrying about residency permits and places of employment. Only by their common efforts can the countryside and the city save the country from the threat of famine.

Decrease in Livestock Threatens 'Food Disaster'

PM1903162991

[Editorial Report] Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 March 1991 Union Edition carries on page 3 under the headline "What Is Happening to Livestock Numbers?" a graph containing data from the USSR State Committee for Statistics as of 1 January for each of the years 1986 through 1991 relating to the numbers of livestock and poultry in all categories of farms (in millions of head). The graph may be rendered as follows:

	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
Cattle	120.9	122.1	120.6	119.6	118.4	115.6
of which, cows	42.9	42.4	42.0	41.8	41.7	41.4
Hogs	77.8	79.5	77.4	78.1	79.0	75.6
Sheep and goats	147.3	148.7	147.3	147.5	145.4	140.1
Poultry (state sector)	1,165.5	1,174.2	1,175.3	1,199.5	1,213.9	1,206.1

The graph is followed by an unattributed commentary, which reads:

"The above figures attest that we have not had such low numbers of livestock and poultry in our livestock units not only during the said years but also, in practice, during the past 10 years. The reduction in the numbers of animals in the livestock units of collective and state farms and inter-farm enterprises is now rapidly

increasing. Add to this the drop in milk yields, wight increases, and the productivity of laying hens, and it will become clear that, unless these processes are halted, we will arrive at a food disaster not in some remote future but in as short a time as one year.

"There is no exaggeration in such a sad conclusion, for the averaged-out figures cited in the graph smooth out the picture somewhat. In actual fact, it is far more terrible. In Georgia, for example, the number of cattle has fallen by 11 percent compared with 1 January 1990, the number of cows by 19 percent, and poultry by 23 percent. There is a similar picture in livestock units in Azerbaijan, Lithuania, Moldova, Latvia, Armenia, Estonia, and many oblasts of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]. Flocks of sheep and goats have diminished by 1 million head in Kazakhstan and by 715,000 in Kirghizia, while there are almost 4 million fewer in the RSFSR. The drop in livestock numbers has reached menacing proportions. Last year alone the country's livestock units lost 3 million head of cattle, 8.8 million hogs, and 10.1 million sheep and goats."

Negligence in Grain Farming Activity Scored

PM2103151191 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 21 Mar 91 p 1

[Article by Nikolay Osychkin under the "Topic of the Day" rubric: "We Must Attend to the Grain Fields!"]

[Text] Spring has begun making its passage across the expanses of our homeland, although not uniformly so far. The sun is warming up, the snow is disappearing, and the roar of machinery is heard in the fields. True to their age-old duty, farmers will again sow seed to grow ears of grain —the basis of our life and existence. Spring work has begun in the south Ukraine, in Moldova, the North Caucasus, and Central Asia. Machine operators are engaged in moisture-rentention work in the fields and are applying fertilizer and beginning sowing.

The further development of grain farming remains the main thrust in agriculture. Last year almost 240 million tonnes of grain were harvested in the country. But people did not handle it properly everywhere. Some grain was damaged by the bad fall weather and some was distributed among the households for "storage." State granaries received only 68 million tones of grain—far below the requirements of the state order. Confusion in purchase prices and the desire of farm leaders to hold back some grain for direct exchange with industry also had an impact. With the result that a number of oblasts and republics have arrived at spring with meager supplies of flour for baking bread. The government has again been forced to purchase grain abroad. Yet if we had been more economical and had handled the whole harvest sensibly, we could have done without an overseas benefactor.

On the eve of large-scale spring sowing work every kolkhoz and sovkhoz and every farmer is right to ask the question: Where is our national pride? Are we really not in a position to reliably grow big harvests, store the crops, and feed our people with our own grain? If we are in a position to do so, then, despite various political insinuations circulating in society, agricultural workers should, with the help of the working class, be laying down a sound foundation in the grain fields this very spring and producing as much grain as is needed to feed people and meet the needs of stockraising.

But the work that lies ahead here is huge. Because of last fall's bad weather, large areas intended for winter rye and wheat remained unsown. Fall plowland was not plowed everywhere and in some fields, specially in the Non-Chernozem Zone, straw lies in heaps and the crop even remains on the stalk. In short, the amount of work has increased by at least 25 percent—this at a time when on many farms' equipment is in disrepair and tractors and sowing and cultivating machines are at no more than 83-percent readiness in the country as a whole. Delivery of new equipment threatens to be disrupted.

The country's president and the USSR Cabinet of Ministers are concerned by the prevailing situation. Urgent measures to complete preparation for sowing have been examined at recent conferences with M.S. Gorbachev and in the government. It has been noted that industry is disrupting the supply of spare parts, fertilizer, plant-protection agents, construction, packaging, and crating materials, machines, and equipment. Leaders of the USSR Gossnab [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply], the USSR Ministry of Automotive and Agricultural Machine Building, the USSR Ministry of the Chemical and Petroleum Refining Industry, the USSR Ministry of the Timber Industry, the State Agrochemical Association, and other ministries and departments producing materials and equipment for agriculture must decisively speed up the supply of spares, cultivating and sowing machinery, and fuel and lubricants in order that the whole of the field work, which has substantially increased this year, be carried out. And all this has to be be done in a matter of days. Leaders of ministries, departments, agricultural organs, kolkhozes, and sovkhozes and Communists of rural party organizations must take urgent measures to ensure that all collective, state, and private farms are fully ready to start sowing, to carry it out to a high standard, to achieve the highest gross yields of grain, and to considerably boost the state's food resources.

But at present only half the seed stock has been brought up to first- and second-class sowing condition on the farms of the Russian Federation, Armenia, Turkmenistan, and certain other regions. Exchange operations are being carried out very slowly, particularly in the Non-Chernozem Zone of the RSFSR, where extremely little seed is fit for sowing. Farms in Novgorod, Pskov, Kostroma, Kirov, Perm, and certain other oblasts have the opportunity to carry out additional cleaning, drying, and sun-heating of seed and thereby enhance its germinative capacity. But this work is not being done everywhere. The importance of changing strains—the replacement of old strains by new, high-yielding strains adapted to local conditions—in improving grain yields is increasing. But

this work is being neglected and farms are missing out on millions of tonnes of wheat, barley, buckwheat, and millet. It would be useful for agronomists to look at their storehouses now, examine their seed stocks, and take additional measures to improve their quality.

There are many other factors which ensure a high yield from the grain fields. Intensive techniques require the application of full doses of organic and mineral fertilizers. Scientists' calculations and practice show that the sensible use of them makes it possible to increase gross yields of grain 20-25 percent. In fact no fertilizer at all is being applied to more than one-quarter of areas under cereals [zlakovyy] and the required correlation of nutritional elements is not being achieved. There is a lack of phosphorous and potash fertilizers in particular, which it is important to consider when producing a new harvest.

A group of VASKhNIL [V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences] scientists recently voiced well-founded alarm in SELSKAYA ZHIZN over the increased threat of the large-scale appearance of plant pests and diseases. The forecast indicates that this will be seriously detrimental. According to preliminary calculations, farms could lose 10-12 million tonnes of grain alone. To prevent this it is essential to take urgent measures to protect the future harvest. This involves increasing our output of chemical and other plant protection agents and urgently purchasing abroad the most effective pesticides and herbicides, which are in short supply.

Regarding the need to boost grain production in the country, I would like to dwell on the negative factor of the emergent trend to reduce the area of grain crops. This particularly concerns wheat, barley, and certain pulse crops. This dangerous trend could reduce gross yields of grain, particularly as yields are increasing only slowly in certain regions.

The word "grain" combines those most vital human ideas of life, labor, and health. Ears of grain are entwined in the USSR's emblem. Bread and salt are the traditional marks of hospitality shown to friends, and sweet-smelling slices of bread are the first food on our table. So let us show our state's grain fields special care and do everything possible to ensure that our grain resources become inexhaustible. The spring grain fields await our careful labor.

Agricultural Equipment Problems Viewed

PM2603112391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Mar 91 Union Edition p 3

[Third part of a survey by V. Gavrichkin: "Time To Save Future Harvest"; first two paragraphs are IZVESTIYA introduction; last paragraph is IZVESTIYA note]

[Text] There is a folk saying that the spring day feeds the year. That may be only a figure of speech, but it is precise and far-reaching. In previous items (IZVESTIYA Nos. 66-67), considering the state of the arable land, winter crops, and sees, we tried to determine where our future harvest could suffer damage and from what.

But today there will be talk of what is perhaps the most burning problem during spring field work.

3. On the Chrome "Horse"

Statistics attest that as of today there are 378,000 tractors, 250,000 trucks, 200,000 plows, and 130,000 sowing machines remaining unrepaired on the country's farms, as does a whole multitude of cultivators, diskers, potato planters, hitches, compactors, and other trivia without which, however, there is nothing to do on the spring field. But unfortunately statistics will never say whether this whole armada will go out onto the strips for tillage at all.

On the other hand we may assert with complete justification that it will not. Proof?

In Karaganda Oblast, for instance, only 86 percent of the powerful "Kirovets" tractors have been repaired. The remainder, because of the lack of so-called piston category, plunger pairs [plunzhernyye pary], and batteries, may remain in the yard. That would still be a half victory. But of those K-700 tractors which are reckoned to be ready 400 are completely "unshod." Nor are there any tires for 2,000 trucks—they have not been delivered and it is not known whether the Chimkent and Dnepropetrovsk tire makers will deliver them at all in time for the sowing campaign. There is also a big question mark over batteries: of the quota of 362,700 batteries the USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply's "Elektrotekhopttorg" has issued Kazakhstan with delivery licenses for only 218,300. Yet a delivery license is as yet only a piece of paper.

By the summer 1,000 "Kirovets" tractors and 1,500 KAMAZ trucks will be without batteries in Voronezh Oblast. Because of the nondelivery of spare parts every fifth tractor is unprepared for work in Novosibirsk Oblast. Not a single clutch disk for the 17,000 MTZ tractors in Altay Kray has been received from allocations...

In such a critical situation, people locally are not of course sitting idly by. In Chelyabinsk Oblast repair workers at agro-industrial enterprises and mechanical workshops are repairing over 90 percent of the units and components which were to be replaced.

The Tatarstan industrial enterprises have produced spare parts worth 6 million rubles [R] and rendered various services to rural machine operators worth R14 million.

Of course, often the semi-cottage industry production of spare parts by local enterprises costs the kolkhozes and sovkhozes a pretty penny: The cost of such components is five to 10 times higher than the list price. But they don't care about cost, the farms are ready to pay.

We have this, in a situation where the total capacity of the repair plants is larger than that of all agricultural machine building enterprises. Truly here it is a case of if you're going to be sick, then do it properly. The backward, long ailing machine building has caused a veritable cancer in the shape of the repair industry on the body of the country's economy. But we must investigate not the consequences but the causes.

High-ranking departments out of habit still say and write: "Despite a whole series of government instructions the USSR Ministry of Automotive and Agricultural Machine Building has failed to take steps to rectify the situation with regard to the delivery of spare parts and equipment." But meanwhile at the edge of the grain fields processes with unpredictable consequences have already begun.

Let us draw the attention of all those who are in any way involved in supplying equipment to agriculture. Kolkhozes and sovkhozes have drastically reduced the writing off of machinery and mechanisms which have come to the end of their lifespan.. Everything which can be restored and put to work is restored. But what can you do if the volume of spring work has doubled or trebled. Let us suppose that the almost implausible happens: The arable farmers cope with the sowing campaign not just anyhow, but like true peasants, thoroughly and on time. But we are convinced that that sowing will be the last successful campaign of the year.

First because by putting back into commission machinery which essentially consists of scrap metal the rural machine operators, without wanting to, are generating a whole chain of problems. Because worn out equipment is automatically removed from the "allowance": Neither spare parts nor fuel is provided for it. And, second, the very fact that old machinery is being put back into commission is evidence of the very severe crisis of agricultural machine building.

Indeed, even supply workers who have seen it all cannot recall anything like we have now. At a time when each new machine is worth its weight in gold, in January through February alone there was a delivery shortfall to agriculture of 10,000 tractors, 11,200 reaping machines, 15,000 trucks, 7,000 plows, and 2,100 cultivators.

Look at what is being delivered... The Volgograd tractor plant sends tractors without...caterpillar tracks and the Altay plant and several others send them without cabs and tanks. Something unbelievable is happening to prices. For instance, the tractor builders demanded from the Karaganda farmers an additional R20,000 for each of their K-700 tractors, in addition to the set payment. The Yurgenskiy plant has asked for an exorbitant R250,000 for cranes costing R31,000. Ruinous "barter" is flourishing. For instance, in addition to payment, the machine builders are asking for 7,000 tonnes of meat for a KSS-2.6 feed harvesting combine.

And through all this the Ministry of Automotive and Agricultural Machine Building is playing with indicators: In allocating equipment to rural inhabitants it is guided not by quotas but by contracts for delivery. Understandably, the contracts concluded provide for less equipment than should be handed out under the quotas.

Yet they have already landed in trouble! In the past two years the country's agro-industrial complex has slid back to the level of the early eighties in terms of its level of technical provision. With what banana republic we will draw level tomorrow we can only speculate. Yet the saddest thing is that we will draw level with a banana republic. For instance for 1991 it has already been planned to delivery machinery worth R2.1 million less to the agro-industrial complex (taking into account the reduction in purchases of equipment abroad). So perhaps there has been enough deliberate confusing of the issue, perhaps it is time to stop shouting from the rooftops about priority for agriculture.

Actually radically improving the situation in agriculture without close linkage with or, as it is now fashionable to say, outside the context of the country's entire economy is a task we know to be insoluble. We must obviously now talk of urgent aid for the countryside which the country must render by every means, disengaging itself from its other needs, for we all want to eat.

After all, those machine builders can and must be understood too: They are not gods, they cannot make even a humble spade out of thin air. For instance, we shout: "Where are the tractors?—yet in the yard of the Minsk tractor plant there is no room to turn round for the MTZ tractors the machine operators want so badly, but each tractor is either "unshod" or incomplete. There are no deliveries. There is a shortage of plastic, pipes, pig iron, and high-quality and sheet steel and no one knows when it will all arrive. The tough administrative method is defunct but we cannot wait for the birth of real economic interests among our industrial monopolies.

That is so with regard to equipment which comes through the state order. And what has not come under the state order you can consider lost: Its production is not backed up at all by material resources.

So far things are slightly easier as regards fuel. But shortfalls in its delivery are substantial. But even where adequate gasoline and diesel fuel have been laid in there is an acute shortage of oil. That means that even with full fuel tanks the vehicles will come to a halt in the fields. Why? For the production of oils we lack the necessary additives, which (of course) were bought abroad. The result is that they have again "saved" at the harvest's expense. And you cannot help thinking bitterly: Perhaps we should not bother raising our own harvest, but buy it abroad without "additives," immediately in its pure form, so to speak.

This item was prepared by V. Gavrichkin on the basis of information from the USSR State Committee for Statistics, the State Commission for Food and Purchases, and IZVESTIYA correspondents V. But, A. Yershov, A. Zinovyev, A. Illarionov, M. Kurgalina, V. Kulagin, E. Matskevich, V. Mirolevich, V. Nikolayeva, O. Stefashin, and G. Shcherbina.

Scientific

Cosmos-2138 Satellite Launched, Operational

LD2703092791 Moscow TASS in English 0916 GMT 27 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 27 TASS—An artificial earth satellite, Cosmos-2138, was launched by a carrier rocket in the Soviet Union on Tuesday [26 March].

It carries scientific equipment designed to continue the space exploration programme.

The Sputnik was put into an orbit with the following parameters:
—the initial period of revolution—89.6 minutes,
—the maximum distance from the surface of the earth (in apogee)—369 kilometres,
—the minimum distance from the surface of the earth (in perigee)—175 kilometres,
—the inclination of the orbit—67.2 degrees.

Apart from scientific equipment, the Sputnik also has a radiosystem for the precise measurement of the orbit parameter, a radiotelemetric system to transmit back to earth data on the operation of the instruments and scientific equipment.

Everything is functioning normally.

Dzasokhov, Academicians Discuss Science Policy

PM2103141191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Mar 91 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "Party and Science"]

[Text] Among its program documents the 28th CPSU Congress adopted a resolution "On CPSU Policy in the Sphere of Education, Science, and Culture" and set up a party commission to deal with these questions. The congress' decision is aimed at implementing major steps designed to boost the role of science in the radical transformation of Soviet society.

With a view to practically promoting the implementation of the outlined program to raise Soviet science to world level in its main spheres, a meeting was held at the CPSU Central Committee involving A.S. Dzasokhov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; CPSU Central Committee Members: Academician N.P. Laverov; Academician G.I. Marchuk, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; G.A. Yagodin, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences; V.V. Ryabov, head of the CPSU Central Committee Humanitarian Department; Academicians G.A. Mesyats, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and K.V. Frolov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; and I.D. Kovalchenko, academician-secretary of the USSR Academy of Sciences History Department; and other representatives of the scientific public.

They discussed the results of the recent session of the USSR Academy of Sciences annual general meeting, the preparation of proposals for the examination of the question of party policy in the sphere of basic science in the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, and the participation in this work of party organizations at scientific institutions and VUZ's [higher educational establishments]. Ideas were also voiced regarding the composition of academic working groups, the main directions in studying the problem "The Party and the Scientific Community," and measures to preserve the USSR Academy of Sciences as an integral intellectual organism of the country.

The meeting's participants noted the profound changes taking place in the life of the country's scientific community: Freedom of creative quest has broadened, the democratization of science's management is under way, and the integration of various spheres of scientific knowledge is deepening.

At the same time, on the basis of today's real problems attention was drawn to the fact that the scale of the development of science and technology, given the complex processes of shaping a qualitatively new economic milieu and political reform, necessitates the elaboration and implementation of a strong state policy in the scientific sphere and the creation of favorable financial and legal conditions for it. Society cannot progress without the priority development of science, without creating a system for its state-social regulation, and without enhancing the status of science in society, scientists' prestige and social protection, and particularly concern for young scientists. Realization of the role and significance of intellectual work is one of the criteria of a society's culture and civilization. Regrettable examples of the underestimating and ignoring scientific creative work have had an adverse impact on the progressive development of society.

Great concern was voiced over the critical state of social sciences. It is time to intensify studies of key questions of social development and problems of Soviet history, something of tremendous significance for asserting civic duty among scientists and society as a whole.

Analysis of the prevailing situation suggested the following conclusion: CPSU party committees at all levels should be more effective in promoting the activity of scientific collectives and help the formation of a healthy moral climate and maximum freedom in the creative quest.

Military

General Outlines Military Reform Plans

LD2603161291 Moscow TASS in English 1547 GMT 26 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow March 26 TASS—"The Soviet military reform that is being implemented envisages the further reduction of the armed forces, their numerical strength and main systems of arms", General Fedor Ladygin, chief of the Legal Agency of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, told TASS. He gave an interview today in connection with the planned reduction of U.S. armed forces announced by U.S. Defence Secretary Robert Cheney.

"The intentions of the U.S. side are assessed in the USSR as positive, although this step was expected to be taken much sooner", Ladygin said.

He noted that the Soviet Union's unilateral decisions on the reduction of USSR armed forces, adopted in 1988, have already resulted in the disbandment of the agencies of two military districts, of four all-arms and one rocketry armies, of five army corps, five rocketry divisions, four divisions of anti-aircraft forces. As many as 38 armoured and motorised rifle divisions have been reduced. The reductions applied to 27 rocketry regiments, two large air units of military districts, two air divisions, six anti-aircraft rocketry brigades and a number of other units.

As a result of these reductions the numerical strength of the USSR armed forces reduced by over 460,000 servicemen as compared with the numerical strength in 1988. He added that in European part of the USSR and Army units the number of tanks decreased by 20.5, thousand of armoured vehicles by 19.3 thousand, artillery systems by 28.4 thousand and military aircraft by 1,950.

"A total of 26 submarines and 45 surface ships and launches were withdrawn from service and scrapped in the Navy," the general said.

Ladygin noted that the military organisation of the Warsaw Treaty will be dissolved before March 31, 1991 and that the Soviet Union will complete troop withdrawals from Czechoslovakia and Hungary by July 1, 1991. "Soviet troop withdrawal from Germany continues and troop withdrawal from Poland begins this year," he said.

Ladygin believes that a new military-political situation has formed in Europe. "Any plans and, the main thing, practical steps by the United States and its NATO allies in the reduction of their military potentials could help create new structures of collective security in Europe", Ladygin said.

Confiscated Weapons Put on Display

PM2603132991 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 26 Mar 91 First Edition p 4

[Report by N. Belan: "'Amateur' Arsenal"]

[Text] Only recently these weapons were killing, burning, and destroying. Only a year, six months, or even a few months ago they were adding to the toll of human tragedy in the country's so-called "hot spots." Assault rifles, machine guns, rifles, and pistols dating back to the Great Patriotic War, modern models of these weapons, shotguns and sports rifles, and also homemade weapons: grenades, mortars, grenade throwers, assault rifles, and various types of pistols, nonfirearms—knives, files, chains, clubs.... All this, confiscated from gangs and thugs over the past year and stored at military depots, was displayed yesterday to journalists at a briefing held by the USSR Defense Ministry press center. A terrifying picture chilled us to the bone—after all before us were only samples of the terrible refinements and inventiveness of human hands and technical thinking, created for a single purpose: sowing death. It is true that, on the lips of those who use these weapons and direct them against civilians, it is called something else. For instance, the struggle for sovereignty and national interests and even for the assertion of democracy.

The dry figures are on the stands. In Estonia 2,707 firearms, 259 of these being combat weapons, and 1.4 million items of ammunition were confiscated from thugs while in Latvia the figures were respectively 4,015, 445, and 100,000 and in Lithuania 10,046, 790, and 4 million.... The picture for Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaijan is also impressive. How many weapons still remain in people's hands! Including foreign weapons.

"We are particularly alarmed by the series production of homemade assault rifles and pistols under factory conditions by skilled specialists," I was told by Colonel P. Zakharchenko, chief of the Main Missile and Artillery Administration firearms group. "As a rule its quality is very high and individual models even have grooves in the barrels. Arc welding and spot welding and drop forging are used during their production. That is it is not isolated handicraftsmen who are operating, the matter has been set up seriously, on a flow line basis, and serial numbers are even inscribed on some models of assault rifle."

The military units and depots are another source of weapons.

"Since 1988 the number of thefts of weapons in the Army has increased drastically, although previously there was a steady tendency toward the reduction of such instances," Major General V. Gorbatko, deputy chief of the Main Missile and Artillery Administration, explained.. "Above all there are piratical attacks on depots. Judge for yourselves. Of the total quantity of weapons stolen in 1990 in the ground forces 47 percent were stolen in piratical attacks. Here sentries die or are wounded. So that today the task is not simply to guard the depots but also to defend them."

"With the appearance of homemade weapons does there arise the problem of the extremists' acquisition of ammunition?" I ask.

"Absolutely right. An analysis of the situation in the Baltic republics, for instance, shows that as soon as their stock of cartridges for foreign weapons ran out they began to seek ways of steeling ammunition from depots and from military units. Unfortunately the servicemen themselves sometimes enter into criminal collusion with the thugs."

The present situation in the country is complex. That also explains the need for weapons for those pursuing their own selfish aims. "Weapons for the counterrevolution" was the name given to this exhibition by one officer who gave explanations to journalists. Perhaps that was harshly put, but there is a degree of truth in his words.

Baltic Republics

Latvia, Poland Sign Cooperation Agreement

LD2703053191 Warsaw PAP in English 2154 GMT 26 Mar 91

[Text] Riga, March 26—Poland and Latvia signed an inter-governmental agreement on cooperation, vice-president of the Latvian parliament Andrejs Krastins has said while commenting on his recent visit to Poland.

Krastins, who stayed in Poland at the invitation of Senate Speaker Andrzej Stelmachowski, said the Polish Sejm, Senate and Foreign Ministry were ready to develop closer relations with Latvia but they hesitated due to the "complicated contacts with the USSR."

Estonia's Russian Deputies Appeal to RSFSR

LD2603211991 Moscow TASS in English 2052 GMT 26 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Kharchenko]

[Text] Tallinn March 26 TASS—"Expressing the opinion of the majority of the Russian-speaking population of Estonia, we call on you not to ratify the treaty on inter-state relations between the Russian Federation and the Estonian Republic," reads an appeal to people's deputies of the Russian Federation, signed by almost 25 per cent of Estonia's deputies.

The document was today sent to the forthcoming Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation.

The appeal reads that the treaty is based on negating the status of the Russian Federation and the Estonian Republic as Union republics within the framework of the Soviet Union, a sovereign federative state.

The treaty confirms the Estonian parliament's resolutions dated March 30, 1990 and August 7, 1990, admitting the illegal character of the Soviet Union's state power in Estonia and declares invalid the declaration on Estonia's inclusion in the Soviet Union, the appeal reads.

The treaty announces that the Soviet law on the inclusion of Estonia in the Soviet Union does not bind the Estonian Republic, and talks with the Soviet Union will be held on the basis of the peace treaty between Russia and Estonia dated February 2, 1920.

The appeal notes that the treaty sanctioned the elimination of citizenship of the Soviet Union and the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic and limited the rights and freedoms of the Russian-speaking population in Estonia. The treaty has allowed nationalists and separatists in the Estonian parliament to adopt laws violating human rights.

The first reading of the discriminating law on the register of electors in the Estonian Republic has been passed, stripping part of the Russian-speaking population of electoral franchise and humiliating the honour and dignity of Soviet citizens, the appeal reads.

The treaty was signed without consultations with the group of Russian-speaking deputies in the Estonian parliament, although Russian President Boris Yeltsin had promised this, the appeal reads.

Estonian Troops Not To Serve Outside Republic

LD2503121691 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1000 GMT 25 Mar 91

[Text] Over the weekend ETA learned that the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs issued an order to dispatch a battalion of Regiment 5460 of the internal forces stationed in Tallinn to a crisis area outside Estonia. Among them 50 young men from Estonia were due to go. Olev Laanjarv, Republic of Estonia minister of internal affairs, sent an urgent telegram to Boris Pugo, USSR minister of internal affairs, on Saturday morning. In it he reminded Pugo that proceeding from the agreement between the Republic of Estonia Government and the USSR Minister of Internal Affairs—the so-called Savisaar-Bakatin treaty of 1 August 1990—issues of this kind must be resolved with a bilateral agreement. There was no reply. This morning, Minister Laanjarv contacted Yuriy Shatalin, chief of the USSR internal forces. During the telephone conversation, an agreement was reached that young men conscripted from Estonia will not be sent outside the republic.

Lithuanian, USSR Maneuvers on Talks Reported

Lithuania Proposes Beginning Talks

LD2603125691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1155 GMT 26 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandras Budris]

[Text] Moscow, 26 Mar (TASS)—Lithuania proposes that "talks on the resumption of interstate relations between the Lithuanian Republic and the Soviet Union" be started in the next few days. This was declared by Deslovas Stankevicius, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet. He arrived in Moscow today to meet with members of a delegation organized by presidential decree with the aim of discussing "a range of political, social, and economic matters" with representatives of Lithuania.

Speaking to journalists, Ceslovas Stankevicius noted that the Lithuanian side proposed that future talks be held in Vilnius. According to Stankevicius, who is empowered to speak on behalf of the head of the Lithuanian legislature, "the talks should be conducted without prior conditions and strong-arm pressure." He explained that such "prior conditions" include the demand by the Soviet side for "the sovereignty of the USSR over Lithuania to be recognized."

Several days ago, a telegram addressed to the Lithuanian leaders arrived from Vitaliy Doguzhiyev, who heads the delegation set up by a decree of the USSR president. It contains a proposal for the delegation's first meeting to be organized for 26 March.

Lithuanians Wait for Reply

LD2603154991 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 1500 GMT 26 Mar 91

[Text] We just received a report by the Supreme Council Information Bureau:

Members of the Lithuanian state delegation for negotiations with the Soviet Union—having gone to Moscow to meet with Vitaliy Doguzhiyev or his appointed delegation members and to discuss the agenda of the delegations—have so far failed to recceive a positive answer either about this meeting or the proposal stated in a telegram of 25 March by Vytautas Landsbergis for the delegations to meet in Vilnius on 27 or 28 March.

The members of the delegation will wait for an answer at the Lithuanian mission until 1900.

Commenting on this situation, Chairman of the Supreme Council Vytautas Landsbergis said that a Soviet refusal would show an absence of constructive attitude.

Doguzhiyev Proposes 26 Mar Talks

LD2603180791 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 26 Mar 91

[Text] On the subject of negotiation with Lithuania: Understanding the great importance for the inhabitants of Lithuania to discuss the whole range of political, social, and economic issues, the head of the USSR delegation, USSR First Deputy Prime Minister Doguzhiyev proposed resuming the delegations' work on 26 March in an appeal to the leader of the Lithuanian delegation, Landsbergis. No answer was received from the chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet. But it is apparent from a telegram from Vagnorius, the republic's prime minister, that the Lithuanian side is making the start of negotiations dependent on a number of preconditions and proposing that consultations between the sides' representatives be held instead of negotiations between the delegations. To all intents and purposes, that means delaying the dialogue between the official delegations for an indefinite period. As is known, it was precisely the raising of preconditions by the Lithuanian side which made it impossible last year to move on from consultative meetings to official negotiations. This stand forces one to think about how interested the republic's leadership really is in continuing the dialogue. Nevertheless, Doguzhiyev has again forwarded a proposal to resume work by the delegations before the end of this month, without any preconditions, assuming that the problems which exist could be solved during negotiations.

Landsbergis on Meeting Cancellation

LD2703044591 Vilnius International Service in Lituanian 2200 GMT 26 Mar 91

[Text] Today has exposed the Soviet position as totally undefined, as to what they want if they really wish to begin negotiations. This is what Vytautas Landsbergis said to Vilnius Radio late this evening on the meeting [between Lithuanian delegation members and Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Doguzhiyev] that failed to take place. In his words, the Soviet Union does not appear very serious; both sides are talking about the beginning of negotiations, we arrive with definite proposals, while they refuse. So why is that game (?necessary)? Vytautas Landsbergis remarked to the Vilnius Radio correspondent: I think Vitaliy Doguzhiyev has acted incorrectly and I wonder whether President Gorbachev will commend him for that. Do they seek only an empty gesture, without any content?

[Vilnius International Service in English at 2300 GMT on 26 March, in a similar report adds: "Vytautas Landsbergis said: They do not even know on what issues we could negotiate. Do they want, by the very fact of the meeting of the two delegations, to legitimize the prior conditions they imposed on us, that is the takeover of buildings, and thus continue such takeovers under the cover of negotiations? Or do they genuinely agree to start constructive negotiations with both content and a goal?

["According to Landsbergis, the goal of the talks is clearly defined by the United States and other Western countries. The goal is a settlement of relations, expressing the unanimous will of our nation to restore state independence."]

Radio Vilnius Reports Further OMON Violence

LD2703094191 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 0700 GMT 27 Mar 91

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Gintautas Kunigelis, born in 1965, was brought to the Vilnius hospital yesterday. Yesterday, in broad daylight, he was detained by the Special Purpose Militia Units [OMON] and was beaten with truncheons. He was taken to the military commandant's headquarters where he was beaten until he lost consciousness.

Doctors established that he had suffered concussion and that his nose was broken. The OMON and servicemen interrogated him, asking why he did not serve in the Soviet Army although the man is almost 25 years old and has two children.

Incidentally, Kunigelis does not remember the very last stage of the interrogation, because he lost consciousness.

The violence of the OMON and the troops is continuing and it seems that Moscow is not going to take any measures to curb it.

Pugo Promises To Investigate

LD2703103991 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 1000 GMT 27 Mar 91

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Three Supreme Council deputies visited Moscow yesterday: Romualdas Ozolas, Zita Slicyte, and Egidijus Klumbys. They met Boris Pugo, USSR minister of the interior, and informed him about the criminal actions of the Special Purpose Militia Units [OMON] as well as the illegal activity of USSR Procurator Petrauskas in Lithuania.

Pugo promised to investigate the situation. Yet another commission will be sent to Lithuania from Moscow. [passage omitted]

Landsbergis on Year Since Independence Act

PM2203150991 Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 13 Mar 91 p 1

[ELTA report: "Road to Asserting Lithuania's Independence"]

[Excerpts] The third Lithuanian Supreme Council session began 11 March. It began exactly a year after the Act on Restoring Lithuania's Independence was proclaimed, along with other historic documents for Lithuania. Therefore this session's first session was a solemn occasion. [passage omitted]

Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, delivered a report entitled "The Year of the Restoration of an Independent Lithuanian State."

Noting that historic acts for Lithuania were adopted exactly a year ago in this hall, V. Landsbergis said:

That day opened a new, brighter page in our history, closing the heavy, gloomy tome of the decades of bondage. On the other hand, this page was only the beginning of a qualitatively new stretch of the road to full independence.

Today the meaning and crux of our decision is clear to us today—to those of us who want to see this. We said everything clearly and in full at once. We were honest with Lithuania, with the voters, with the present and with history, and ultimately with ourselves, just as we were honest with our adversary, who was offered an open, honest way out. Let us close the history of this Stalinist crime 50 years on: Let us rectify what we can, then we will look to the future and will forget our other grievances most speedily and live as good neighbors. That was our proposition, but our neighbor did not agree, preferring to commit the same offense as 50 years ago.

A new phase in the struggle began—the first year of our restored state independence. The first phase now looks like the Soviets inflicting chaotic blows on Lithuania in hatred and rage. These attacks were prompted by the empire's unbounded outraged spite and our omnipotent masters' taunts. In its policy this country traditionally wants to mockingly humiliate and smash things. To engage in a show of force and use of violence. We had tanks and armored vehicles on Lithuania's highways and city streets day and night, helicopters over the cities, assault troopers used against guys who had escaped the alien army, and assault and foreign "internal" troops forcing their way into and seizing buildings, property, and people. The USSR totally rejected the possibility of talks with Lithuania and made one demand alone—that we renounce independence. Yet we stood our ground and defended ourselves without helicopters and armored vehicles.

A new stage began—economic warfare and the blockade of Lithuania. Things were no longer chaotic as before, we were now conscious of a well-oiled machine and calculation. We all wanted to believe that there might be glimmers of goodwill. Especially as it was not only abstract comments that were heard in the international political context about the desirable path of talks. We ourselves suggested talks to the Kremlin virtually every day. The USSR leadership still continued issuing ultimatums for some time demanding that we renounce the Act of Independence and recognize the USSR Constitution, but it now laid down conditions for talks and was thus being somewhat more flexible in admitting the possibility of talks: Suspend the 11 March act. The absurdity of the blockade and the political damage to the Soviet Union, however, were increasingly visible and the blockade was officially suspended at the end of June.

The third period began. Who will hold talks and with whom? It was clear to our adversaries that they would be the big whole dealing with one of its components. They described the other position—a state dealing with a state—as a precondition on our part and took up the position of the injured party. They wanted talks on keeping us with them and, at worst, on secession and the settling of accounts and quite successfully convinced the world of that. The mere fact that the Soviet Union was willing to embark on talks seemed a good sign and we no longer paid attention to anything else. Our legal viewpoint—that the occupier should leave and provide compensation for the damage—was not disputed by third countries in Europe or the U.S., but nor was it backed as it should have been.

Therefore the talks are proceeding sluggishly like a game of cat and mouse, apart from the fact that the mouse sometimes starts speaking in an ill-bred manner. The theme is always the same. They say: Why are you digging your heels in, you're still a Soviet republic, comply with the country's laws, and everything will be fine. We say: We are not a Soviet republic, you have only conquered us, we now have our own laws and we are living by those laws.

When we entered the fourth phase in the year of independence—the winter of terrible calamities—the speaker continued, we realized that the total freeze on the delayed talks was no accident. A blow lay in store for

Lithuania. Our neighbors' political agents became insolent, evading legal registration of the CPSU, demanding virtually every day that presidential dictatorship be introduced, and forming more and more bogus organizations—allegedly Lithuanian public organizations—to shriek the same thing on their behalf. It was clearer than in the spring that a coup was being prepared to preserve communists' authority and "socialist gains." The planned military attack, which was efficiently synchronized to coincide with the price hikes and events in the Persian Gulf, was carried out.

This attack has now let up. Someone is thinking, planning something; perhaps they are merely building up new forces, renaming themselves and reorganizing themselves.

In political terms, the first year of our proclaimed revived independence has revealed much of importance, the speaker continued. Lithuania's convalescent, recuperating organism is sweeping aside foreign bodies—be they Soviet structures or appointees, even with Lithuanian surnames. The alien army that refused to reach agreement with the Lithuanian authorities in any way is becoming increasingly alien, and the use of force against the civilian population and installations only speeds up this process. Overt robbery and blatant actions to seize buildings are boosting glasnost since they clarify matters.

We have several choices. We can grow up and develop—as Lithuania's cardinal taught us during the first public prayers at Vilnius' archiepiscopal cathedral—the sanctuary of all Lithuania—which was, we remember, restored during the Sajudis founding congress.

We can rise up and walk—which is what Lithuania has done, as if hearing the words of the New Testament through a grave illness.

We can rally round and work for the good of Lithuania and for the sake of people—as Vincas Kudirka taught us and as we sing in our state anthem and national song.

We also have another choice—we can delve around and muddy the water. We can undermine the already feeble foundation of the state and blacken the sky of independence with fumes of alien noxious air and the smoke of degrading unbelief.

There is love in these choices—love for truth and honesty, love for our nearest and dearest and for our fatherland. Spite, envy, hatred, and sometimes even greed or the interests of a group of comrades are overemphasized in the fourth choice. Let us make the right choice—both those of us who are present here, and throughout Lithuania. A great deal will be required of us and a great deal will be required of everyone since the second year will hardly be any easier than the first. [passage omitted]

Lithuanian Supreme Council Appeals to Democracies

LD2203112991 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 1000 GMT 22 Mar 91

[Text] Yesterday [21 March] the Supreme Council adopted an appeal to the European democratic states, the United States, Canada, Australia, and Japan. It states that the Soviet Union's leadership has failed to condemn and punish a single conspirator or military leader responsible for the 11-13 January massacre in Vilnius.

The appeal says in conclusion: In the situation of an escalation of threats and aggressive actions we appeal and ask you: Do not be indifferent to the new aggression by the Soviet Union against Lithuania. Demand that the Soviet Union discontinue direct military interference in Lithuania's affairs. State that the verification of the Soviet Union's intentions and its new policy is not by words but by actions: the withdrawal of the aggressive terrorist black beret military unit from Vilnius and from the territory of the Republic of Lithuania; the return of the TV and radio buildings in Vilnius and of their cultural wealth, seized by the Soviet Army, to their owner, the Republic of Lithuania. We hope that you will not refuse this way to defend democracy, peace, and human rights in the Baltic region.

Lithuanian CP Issues Statement on Referendum

LD2603235191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1235 GMT 26 Mar 91

[Text] Vilnius, 26 Mar (TASS)—"Despite all the antidemocratic actions by the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, the referendum held on the initiative of labor collectives in the republic took place," says a statement adopted at a session of the Politburo of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee. A certain part in its execution, the document notes, was played by the organization and committees of the Lithuanian Communist Party, which operated with all the republic's democratic forces. Of those who took part in the referendum, 630,000 said "yes" to a renewed USSR. There can be no doubt that many more citizens would have gone to the polls if labor collectives and public organizations had had the opportunity to equip more polling stations. The Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo states that "thanks to the working people of Lithuania, attempts by the separatist bodies and the public formation supporting them to wreck the referendum in the republic were thwarted. The referendum brought to light the Lithuanian toilers' disagreement with the policy of separating the republic from the USSR, crushing democracy, violating human rights and implanting a bourgeois and nationalist dictatorship. The referendum helped the population to realize that the sovereignty, integrity and independence of the Lithuanian socialist state can be guaranteed, the crisis overcome, and the quality of life in Lithuania enhanced only within the USSR, with the republic signing the new Union treaty."

New Lithuanian Security Chief Views Assignment

LD2303062291 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2200 GMT 22 Mar 91

[By correspondent Audrius Matonis]

[Text] Viktoras Zegelis, the new general director of the Lithuanian Security Department, began his duties yesterday.

Mecys Laurinkus, supreme council deputy and presidium member, was released from these duties several days ago upon his own request. Viktoras Zegelis transferred from the General Procuracy to the post of deputy chief of the State Security Department several weeks ago. Viktoras Zegelis told Vilnius Radio that his new appointment, like his predecessor's resignation, has no connection whatsoever with the critical articles that recently appeared in certain Lithuanian newspapers, [words indistinct] activity of the security department.

USSR Summonses for Lithuanians 'Not Binding'

PM2203132791 Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 13 Mar 91 p 4

[ELTA report: "Announcement by Republic Prosecutor General's Office"]

[Text] The USSR Prosecutor's Office investigation group that has arrived in connction with the tragic events in Vilnius 13 January this year is trying to summon and cross-examine witnesses.

The Lithuanian prosecutor general reminds you that investigators from the Lithuanian Prosecutor General's Office Criminal Investigation Department have conducted a preliminary investigation into the criminal proceedings instituted with regard to the public appeals to violate Lithuanian state sovereignty and forcibly overthrow state power and criminal actions by USSR Army servicemen 11-13 January 1991. A considerable amount of evidence has been collected that is of considerable importance as regards establishing the objective truth.

On Lithuanian territory the Lithuanian Prosecutor's Office exercises all functions relating to prosecutions. Therefore calls for Lithuania's inhabitants to show up for cross-examination by USSR Prosecutor's Office investigators are not binding.

Lithuanian Premier Details Price Increases

LD2703000891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1105 GMT 26 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Kazis Uscila]

[Excerpts] Vilnius, 26 Mar (TASS)—The cost of foodstuffs in Lithuania rose significantly today. It has been announced officially here that retail prices for food goods have been increased by an average of 180 percent. Lithuanian Prime Minister Gediminas Vagnorius, who spoke on television, stated that retail prices in the republic have been raised a week earlier than in the Soviet Union "to avoid the devastation of the consumer market". [passage omitted]

Vagnorius explained in his statement that the price increase "is 30 percent lower than that proposed in January, while the compensation paid residents in connection with the increase is twice as much as was planned at the beginning of the year".

The government is also taking a number of measures to avoid an explosion of dissatisfaction by the popluation with the price increase. Managers of enterprises and organizations have been instructed to compensate up to 50 percent of the cost of food in workers' canteens. The government has allocated resources to reduce the price of food in school cafeterias. At the same time, the Lithuanian prime minister did not rule out the possibility of mass protests by the population because of the price increase.

RSFSR

Silayev Reportedly Offers Resignation

Says Yeltsin Probably Resigning

LD2603221391 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1949 GMT 26 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow, March 26 (TANJUG)—President of the Russian parliament Boris Yeltsin will "most probably" submit his resignation to the post on Thursday, Russian Premier Ivan Silayev told a press conference here today.

Russia does not want any confrontation because the "situation in the country is already complex enough and only a consolidation of forces can help us," said Silayev. He announced his own resignation as well.

A session of the Russian Congress of Deputies, the republic's highest body of authority, is scheduled for Thursday.

If submitted, Yeltsin's resignation may be accepted. The balance of forces was barely in his favour at the time of his election when he was more popular than now.

The session should officially verify the results of the referendum which decided on the introduction of the presidential post in Russia.

Yeltsin has already announced he will run for president, which, as a higher post than president of parliament, carries more power. His popularity in Russia is still high enough to allow a possibility of his election.

Remarks on Yeltsin 'Misunderstood'

LD2603231591 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 2032 GMT 26 Mar 91

[Excerpt] Moscow, 26 Mar (TANJUG)—The representatives of the miners who have been on strike for several weeks said tonight that they are prepared to stop the strike if the Russian Government is willing to take on certain commitments which, however, were not spelled out in the statement they issued to the public.

Mining leaders said this during the talks they had tonight in Moscow with Russian Premier Ivan Silayev.

During an earlier meeting with journalists, the Russian premier said that because of the economic troubles he is prepared to submit his resignation during the Russian Congress of Deputies session the day after tomorrow. It appears that his statement that this applies to Boris Yeltsin as well was misunderstood and it was announced later that Silayev has even spoken of Yeltsin's prestige still standing high. [passage omitted]

USSR, Russian Reaction to Demonstration Ban

Tear Gas Use Against Rally Denied

LD2603130891 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 26 Mar 91

[Text] The Soviet deputy minister of the interior, Petr Bogdanov, has said Muscovites will not be talked into joining next Thursday's demonstration slated to mark the opening of an emergency Congress of Deputies of the Russian Federation. He said law and order forces would act to enforce the Cabinet's decision that bans any rallies, pickets, or demonstrations in Moscow from 26th March through 15th April. Petr Bogdanov emphatically refuted rumors that, in case a demonstration did take place without a permit from the government, tear gas and even armored personnel carriers would be used to disperse it. The deputy minister said the police would not overstep the law.

'Democratic Russia' To Demonstrate

LD2603142791 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1350 GMT 26 Mar 91

[Text] The coordinating council of the Democratic Russia movement has decided to hold demonstrations in spite of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers resolution banning meetings and demonstrations in Moscow from today. This decision is illegal, as it breaches the citizens' constitutional right to freedom of meetings, processions, and demonstrations—this was stated in an interview to a correspondent of the Russian news agency today by a member of the Presidium of the Social Democratic Party of Russia, (Pavel Kudyukin).

Pro-Yeltsin Rally Still on

LD2603152191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1445 GMT 26 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondents Lev Aksenov and Yuriy Kozmin]

[Text] Moscow, 26 Mar (TASS)—"Irrespective of the actions" of the Union leadership, the rally and demonstration [manifestatsiya] by Moscovites in support of Boris Yeltsin, timed to coincide with the opening of the Extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies of Russia (28 March), will take place, representatives of the coordinating council of the "Democratic Russia" movement stated at a news conference it organized today.

Those gathered there were informed that an emergency session of the Presidium of the Mossovet [Moscow City Soviet] had taken place today which examined the situation which had arisen subsequent to the decision adopted by the Union Cabinet of Ministers yesterday banning demonstrations in Moscow from 26 March to 15 April. The Presidium of the Mossovet (a majority in it are "Democratic Russia" supporters) refused to subordinate itself to the government's decision, having assessed it as illegal.

The conflict between the Union government and the city authorities may seriously complicate the situation in the capital. As Petr Bogdanov, USSR deputy minister of internal affairs, stated in an interview in PRAVDA today, "the militia will act according to the laws prescribing its conduct in such situations."

Moscow City Soviet Appeals Ban

LD2703003691 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1900 GMT 26 Mar 91

[Text] The Presidium of the Moscow City Soviet, which held an extraordinary meeting today, has decided to present the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Council of Ministers with a proposal to suspend the action of the resolution by the USSR Cabinet of Ministers on a temporary suspension on holding mass meetings, street processions, and demonstrations in Moscow as contradictory to the RSFSR Constitution and the declaration on RSFSR sovereignty.

The same decision contains a request to the USSR Committee for Constitutional Supervision to consider the conformity to existing legislation of the decree by the USSR president on bringing militia in Moscow out of subordination to the Moscow City Executive Committee. If the decree by the USSR president and the resolution by the Cabinet of Ministers are not cancelled, the Presidium of the Moscow City Soviet puts all responsibility for possible consequences on the Union leadership.

TASS Reports Reaction

LD2703121991 Moscow TASS in English 1207 GMT 27 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 27 TASS—A decree of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers "On Temporary Suspension of Meetings and Demonstrations in Moscow" evoked protest from various political forces, including the Moscow municipal authorities.

As reported, the coordination council of the Democratic Russia movement announced that despite the government ban, a pro-Yeltsin rally will be held on Thursday, March 28, the first day of the Third Extraordinary Congress of Russian People's Deputies.

A resolution of the Presidium of the Moscow Municipal Council adopted yesterday says that the government's decision runs counter to the USSR Constitution which guarantees citizens' right to rallies, assemblies and demonstrations.

The Moscow municipal authorities declared that this act violates the declaration of Russian sovereignty and aggravates and destabilises the situation with regard to the Congress of Russian People's Deputies opening on Thursday.

The Legislation Committee of the Russian parliament told "ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA" that the decree is unlawful.

The decree was adopted in response to an address by 29 deputies of the Russian Federation who called on the president and the government to protect them from "aggressively-inclined elements".

Replying to KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, one of the 29 deputies, Viktor Gulyashko, member of the Communists of Russia group of deputies, said that the authors of the address had not intended a ban on rallies in Moscow.

"We only wanted normal conditions for the work of the congress so that deputies going to meetings were not accompanied by persons insulting and threatening them."

Member of the Security Council Vadim Bakatin told a news conference on Tuesday that in his opinion the Cabinet of Ministers' decision was, perhaps, "too hasty" but it should now be complied with. "If you ask me, I believe that bans do not go together well with democratic policy", he said.

Demonstrators 'Will Be Stopped'

LD2703134591 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1300 GMT 27 Mar 91

[Text] The Democratic Russia movement coordinating council has reaffirmed its decision to hold a demonstration and meeting in Manezhnaya Square tomorrow, 28 March, from 1700-1930. This was reported in IZVESTIYA.

As was noted today by dedputy chief of the Moscow Main Internal Affairs Administration, Lev Belyanskiy, the law enforcement organs will attempt to persuade people not to go to the meeting. However, he added, if persuasion doesn't work, the columns of demonstrators will be stopped; they will not get to Manezhnaya Square.

'Armored Troop Vehicles' in Moscow

AU2703140191 Paris AFP in English 1341 GMT 27 Mar 91

[Excerpt] Moscow, March 27 (AFP) Conservative MPs are out to get radical leader Boris Yeltsin, but he is counting on street demonstrators to defend him.

Columns of armoured troop vehicles have been seen arriving in the capital during the last 48 hours as supporters of the outspoken president of the Russian Federation prepare for a trial of strength on Thursday.

At the Kremlin Mr. Yeltsin, who has recently toughened his criticism of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, faces an attempt to remove him from office by a special congress of deputies.

His supporters have decided to flout a ban on a demonstration, and are gearing to confront the militia.

The demonstration called by the reforming "Democratic Russia" movement, has been banned by a governmental decree.

Vadim Bakatin, a member of the new security council charged with assisting Mr. Gorbachev, warned that security forces in the capital had been reorganised to face the challenge and ordered to enforce the government's decision.

Some of the armoured troop transporters seen arriving in Moscow carried armed forces equipped with bullet-proof vests, the reports said. [passage omitted]

'No Armored Troop Carriers'

LD2703142491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1322 GMT 27 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Borisov]

[Text] Moscow, 27 Mar (TASS)—"There will be no armored troop carriers on the streets of the capital on 28 March, the day when the Russian Congress of People's Deputies is to open," Lev Belyanskiy, deputy chief of the Moscow militia, stated at a news conference held here today. He noted that if the mass rallies and demonstrations [manifestatsiya] go ahead in the city despite the bans, "militia personnel will primarily use methods of persuasion. These types of meetings have a destabilizing effect, and even without this, because the situation in the city is unsettled, it is very possible that there could be provocation. Our people intend to act in accordance with the law, but the columns will not pass."

As has already been reported, in spite of the resolution adopted by the USSR Cabinet of Ministers on 25 March that banned the holding of meetings, pickets, marches, and demonstrations between 26 March and 15 April, the coordinating council of the "Democratic Russia" movement affirmed at a news conference here yesterday that "regardless of the actions" of the Union leadership, the meetings and demonstrations by Muscovites in support of the Russian leaders planned for 28 March—the opening day of the extraordinary Russian Congress of People's Deputies—will still go ahead.

TASS on Yeltsin's Prospects at Russian Congress

LD2703123691 Moscow TASS in English 1210 GMT 27 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Igor Yefimov: "Yeltsin Faces Crucial Test at Russian Congress—Comment"]

[Text] Moscow March 27 TASS—On Thursday, Russian President Boris Yeltsin faces a tough test at the Congress of Russian People's Deputies that will be crucial for Soviet reforms and the future of the Soviet Union.

The emergency session of Russia's supreme legislature is to be convened on the demand of a group of lawmakers who claim that Yeltsin's policy is against the interests of Russian citizens.

Dissatisfaction with Yeltsin, Gorbachev's key political rival, has been mounting since January.

Many accused Yeltsin of "betraying the interests of the Russian people" after his statements during events in the Baltics.

His call to create a Russian army, in fact a step towards civil war, also prompted a sharp response.

Discontent with what are seen as Yeltsin's authoritarian methods is rife in the Russian parliament. Recently two of his deputies and chairmen of the two chambers issued a political statement, blasting him for anti-democratic methods and disregard of their opinion.

They aired concern about the fact that Yeltsin created several agencies which are not envisaged by the republican Constitution. Yeltsin recently formed the Supreme Economic Council of his close aides, dubbed by journalists the "shadow cabinet". Yeltsin also formed his own "Presidential Council".

However, the major point of contention is Yeltsin's stance on the new treaty of the Union. Because most Russians unequivocally support the preservation of the USSR, Boris Yeltsin does not openly call for the disbandment of the Union. However, many parliamentarians have repeatedly criticised him for using double standards, accusing him of practical actions to break the country apart.

Autonomous republics within the Russian Federation are also wary of Yeltsin's policy. Most decided against holding a referendum on the introduction of an executive presidency in Russia, suspecting that this could threaten their sovereignty.

The key question on the agenda of Thursday's Congress will be a report about the work of the Russian leadership. Yeltsin is likely to face a vote of no-confidence at the forum.

In May 1990, he was elected chairman of the Russian parliament on a four-vote majority after three ballots.

It is difficult to forecast the outcome of the possible no-confidence vote. On the one hand, somber-minded politicians have become increasingly critical of Yeltsin. His rash, impulsive statements often spawn disagreement even among his supporters.

On the other hand, Yeltsin's populist slogans and an image of supporter of the common people make him extremely popular among the masses.

Khasbulatov Sees Yeltsin Win

LD2703084891 Moscow TASS in English 0808 GMT 27 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondents Lev Aksenov and Yuriy Kozmin]

[Text] Moscow March 27 TASS—First Deputy Chairman of the Russian parliament Ruslan Khasbulatov is convinced that the emergency Congress of Russian People's Deputies, which opens on Thursday, will bolster the stance of Russian President Boris Yeltsin—Mikhail Gorbachev's key political rival.

In a TASS interview Khasbulatov said he believes the congress will "increase the role and functions of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet and the parliament's leadership".

The congress has been convened at the demand of deputies dissatisfied with Yeltsin's policy.

However, the supreme legislature will be influenced by the results of the March 17 referendum in which most Russians supported the introduction of an executive presidency in the largest Soviet republic.

During the Russian referendum, people voted overwhelmingly in support of Boris Yeltsin, who is expected to run for the post, according to Khasbulatov.

Khasbulatov accepted criticism of parliamentary work. The key mistake is the failure to realise Russia's political sovereignty "within the powers we preserved delegating considerable rights and functions to the Centre", he said.

Progress has been reached in legislative work, Khasbulatov said. "We changed the legal system in our state, first and foremost in the economic sphere, so that it would function in the near future as any normal economic system," he said.

Important decisions aimed to ensure human rights in the political, economic and social spheres have been taken. Russian lawmakers paid much attention to land reforms, he said.

"As for the question of what and who impedes our work, these are central agencies and local bureaucrats," he said.

In his report at the congress, Boris Yeltsin will make a "tough and frank analysis of what we have done, what interfered with our work, and in what way are our future plans", he said.

The report contains "a real programme of practical steps to take Russia out of its deep crisis", he said.

Silayev Briefs Journalists on Economic Measures

LD2603155991 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1310 GMT 26 Mar 91

[Text] Silayev, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation, today held a news conference at which he has acquainted journalists with his government's plans for basic measures to stabilize the economy and make the transition to the market.

He has characterized the current situation as being one of crisis and he has added that if vigorous measures are not taken it will soon became catastrophic. The new program is not an alternative to previous ones, including the famous "500 days" program. It is a realistic plan for the implementation of the basic points of principle in that program, with the main emphasis being on its implementation within the Russian Federation. This is what Silayev said, and I would now like you to listen to a short recording of this news conference:

[Begin recording] [Silayev] We have reached the conclusion that a vigorous transition to market relations is essential within a short period of time. Therefore, we are devoting most of our attention to manufacturers, to stimulating the population's spirit of enterprise. This expresses itself in making tax-exempt those funds which are invested in production in any guise, from an enterprise to a specific entrepeneur, so as to expand production. This means a reduction, a significant reduction of several other tax elements by which we hope to prompt entrepreneurs to take an active role in the production sphere. We mean the lowering of the upper limit of the income tax rate for all citizens so that it does not exceed 30 percent.

An important issue is to allow the free buying and selling of foreign currency on our territory. We must adopt a number of resolutions in our supreme soviet on this, regarding the abolition of the restrictions which still apply, including those which are reflected in the Criminal Code.

The issues of privatization are important. They occupy a fairly large place in our program. You know that to a certain degree, we have started this privatization by announcing the right to private ownership of land. These processes are actively proceeding today, although not without opposition. But we are intending to rapidly privatize everything which, let us say, is connected in some way with agriculture, up to and including the shops which sell agricultural produce.

We do not see the possibility of our economy functioning successfully, particularly in market conditions, without changes in interaction with our territories and our republics. We are planning to resolve a broad range of issues which offer, in a concrete fashion, economic independence to the regions and territories where either raw materials are extracted, or where production occurs and also many other economic and organizational rights which we would like to transfer from the authority of the Russian Government to the direct authority of the territory, taking into account that the main concerns in production and the main social events and so on are resolved right there, and we intend to actively cooperate to achieve this.

We realize all the same that in isolation, without interaction, and even more so, without support—as they say, in one republic taken in isolation—we cannot resolve all of this. I am not talking about the credit and banking system—we have an interesting idea on this a little later—but nevertheless, we will cooperate and we intend to enter into closer contact with the Cabinet of Ministers. We are counting upon the fact that we must agree on a number of the most important issues of principle, and we intend to cooperate, and appeal to all parties—today there are quite a number of them which have been officially registered—and to public movements and organizations, to join and consolidate forces in order to implement our basic plans of action for the market. As it is usually expressed, we are offering to turn swords into plowshares.

[Journalist] Your previous program was precisely worked out for a period of 500 days. On what time scale is the current program based?

[Silayev] The issue here is a plan for practical actions for the period 1991-92, and the practical steps are to start at the beginning of the second quarter.

[Journalist] In my view, one of the main problems is clearly agreement with the center. Ivan Stepanovich, do you not see any contradiction between what the government says and what the chairman of the supreme soviet says? I mean, you say that there is a need to meet them half way, while Boris Nikolayevich in his last speech in Leningrad said that no compromise with the center is possible. Therefore, I would like to ask the following question: Have there been any definite steps towards holding meetings to reach agreement and find some sort of a compromise?

[Silayev] When Yeltsin expresses himself in the sense of which you speak, he means that he has had considerable contact, and several meetings and agreements which unfortunately failed to bear any fruit, and because of this he expressed what could be called disappointment and

little hope about whether it is possible to reach agreement. But it is one thing to speak of political figures and political leaders. But it is the task of governments to find a solution which can work. Therefore, I have already held meetings with Pavlov, several meetings, and these meetings do not of course give me grounds for great optimism, but all the same, I think that by a logical extension of this thought, we can use them to reach agreement, even outside the framework of the new Union treaty. Therefore, as the leader of the republic's body of executive authority, I must make these attempts. [end recording]

Critical Fuel Situation in Maritime Kray

LD2703080791

[Editorial Report] Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian at 0423 GMT on 27 March carries a two-minute report by correspondent Leonid Savitskiy from the Maritime Kray. Savitskiy says that the situation at the coal mining enterprises here could lead to a disaster any day, with industry paralyzed, cities being plunged into darkness, and transport being halted—all because local power stations only have the technology to burn fuel mined in the kray. He says coal miners have recently been letting the power workers down, but not through their own faults. Boris Viktorovich Yelchuk, director of Vladivostok TETs-2, is cited as saying: "We cannot touch this fuel, as it is an untouchable reserve below which we cannot go. We are only getting 9,000 instead of the normal 11,000 tons of coal a day."

Savitskiy says a similar situation prevails at other power stations. Local authorities have taken away land for open cast mining, resulting in a nearly one-third fall in coal production, with miners' wages falling.

Petr Trofimovich (Kiryasov), secretary of Maritime Kray territorial coal miners' trade union, is cited as saying coal deliveries could be halted any time and the situation is compounded by the country's and Russia's governments, which will not talk to the miners.

Lukyanov Reads Referendum Results at Legislature

LD2603135991 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1200 GMT 26 Mar 91

[Text] Today the USSR Supreme Soviet session is continuing its work in Moscow. At the session, the results of the Union referendum were announced.

[Begin Lukyanov recording] Some 185,500,000 people were entitled to vote. Those who received ballots numbered 149 million, and those who took part in the vote numbered 148,500,000, that is to say, 80 percent of all those entitled to vote. Some 113,500,000 people replied affirmatively—that is 76.4 percent—and 32,300,000 replied negatively—that is 21.7 percent. Some 2,700,000, or 1.9 percent of the ballots, were spoiled.

If we take the overall number of voters in the country and the overall adult population of the country, which is over 18 years of age, then more than half of the population of our country said yes to the referendum. [end recording]

Western Republics

Referendum Participants in Kishinev 'Persecuted'

PM2603125191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Mar 91 Union Edition p 3

[Report by S. Drobot: "You Took Part in the Referendum? You're Fired"]

[Text] Kishinev—A meeting of the collective at the "Spetsavtokhozyaystvo" enterprise in Kishinev that deals with city cleaning has threatened its leadership with a strike if nine workers who wanted to take part in the all-Union referendum are not fired by 25 March.

The initial ultimatum was even harsher: for an hour the seditious nine had had to write a "voluntary resignation" letter. The number of people being persecuted had at first been almost four times greater, but since the others saw the error of their ways and repented, they were forgiven. People's Front activists organized a meeting in the collective. A specially created commission held an investigation bringing to light those who had believed the assurances of the republic's leadership that no obstacles would be placed in the way of people taking part in the referendum. These people were subjected to a biased interrogation in the director's office during work time. "Investigators" visited the suspects' apartments, and their workplaces were searched.

Moldavian national television dedicated a special program to the "betrayers of the Moldavian people." Even [electoral] rolls torn up by the terrified participants in the referendum were recovered and presented as evidence. But the culmination was the meeting of the labor collective. The investigating commission, speaking through a representative of the People's Front, branded them "traitors" who "must be sacked." Neither the lawyer's plea that such a decision is unlawful nor the arguments of the legislative deputy who was present could change people's minds. "The law is the people, and we are the people" was the logic that prevailed.

What about the authorities? The republic's prosecutor was informed about the incident but the guardians of law and order confined themselves to maintaining a silent presence at the inquiry. The exhausted and dispirited people despaired of finding a defense. Some had already written the resignation letters demanded of them. The others, despite being high on the apartment waiting list and having many years of work experience behind them, are prepared to follow their example.

Romanian Foreign Minister Assesses Moldova Visit

AU2603112891 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 0957 GMT 26 Mar 91

[Text] Bucharest, ROMPRES, 26/3/1991—In a statement made on his visit in Chisinau [Kishinev], Romanian Foreign Minister Adrian Nastase assessed that the signing of the collaboration protocol between Romania's Foreign Ministry and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Moldova was probably one of the most difficult exercises to Romanian diplomacy since the function of diplomacy was to enter into relations with foreign countries. Or, the minister said, one can hardly consider the Republic of Moldova as a foreign country thinking of the blood, the community of history and language.

We must equally take account of the European realities, we must consider the declaration of sovereignty of the Republic of Moldova, consider the republic's will to embark on the path of full sovereignty and of independence.

We will have for the moment, Nastase said, to accept the idea of existence of two Romanian countries, hoping that the road we will travel together on achieving profound cultural and economic interrelations, of building the cultural and economic confederation, will be able to maintain the present hoping for a future that should allow us to think that the frontier, even spiritualized, might become meaningless between the left and right banks of the Prut. I think it is very important to us to decide whether to observe the declaration of sovereignty of the Republic of Moldova or to stick to some ideas regarding Moldova, Bessarabia as a Romanian province that should be taken over through immediate union.

By my opinion, Adrian Nastase said, it is extremely important that we should very frankly discuss these things in order to understand that such a way at this moment in time is both utopian and counterproductive. It does not take account of the will expressed in the Republic of Moldova and, although it undoubtedly is very appealing emotionally as is but natural, it could only lead to a closing of the contacts between the Republic of Moldova and Romania.

We must clearly distinguish between the political action and the dimension of our feelings, the minister said. I think these things should be spelled out and I also think that once these things said, we will have to really and cleverly start actually building the interrelations I was speaking of, the creation of the permanent links that should virtually destroy the frontier made by the Prut between the two countries. I think that we choose at this moment a different way of crossing the Prut. It is not a violent way, with unforeseeable political effects as regards the reactions in the general context of the European norms and of the balance of forces in our continent. We should cross the Prut from either side, ensuring the necessary permeability so that the links between us may proceed most congenially.

Moldovan Counterpart Views Visit

AU2603113291 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1011 GMT 26 Mar 91

[Text] Bucharest, ROMPRES, 26/3/1991—"The documents signed today by our Foreign Ministry and the Romanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs will give us the possibility to cooperate closer in various fields and surmount the difficulties we encounter", said Moldova's Foreign Minister Nicolae Tiu after the talks with his Romanian counterpart Adrian Nastase.

Our main aim is the struggle for freedom and independence, specified Mr. Tiu. After we have adopted the declaration of sovereignty in Moldova's Parliament, we have many things to do to translate it into fact. Moldova's foreign policy does not enjoy in other countries the authority it deserves. If we are not recognized as an independent state, we shall not be able to gain soon our independence, sovereignty that we talk so much about, but which we hardly feel in the true sense of the word.

Since last year, when your secretary of state Mr. Romulus Neagu visited us, we have cooperated with your ministry. Then we decided on the main lines of cooperation, such as the opening of the consulates, which has already been settled due to you, the opening of other six frontier points. Now we intend to give a different statute to these checkpoints so that the citizens on the left bank of the Prut could freely pass the frontier not only through Leuseni and Albita, where people stand in queues 10 to 15 km. long. Therefore we intend to make Giurgiulesti frontier point a regular car pass, Cahul a bus pass, Sculeni and Costesti-Stinca lorry and bus passes.

In another line of thought, we deem it necessary to create the economic confederation Mr. Nastase was speaking about yesterday and, I should like to add to it, a scientific confederation, because we, too, have interesting things to share with the world, so as we can learn from you.

So this is the first document signed by our countries. It will enable us to give depth to the relations already established. We must not stop, must not forget the people's wish to be together, and, as President Snegur put it, we stick to our kin.

Last Romanian Warsaw Pact Representative Departs

LD2603155791 Moscow TASS in English 1542 GMT 26 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow March 26 TASS—The last Romanian military representative in the Warsaw Treaty Organisation left Moscow for Bucharest today. The Warsaw Treaty military structures are to end their operations on March 31, 1991.

"We both witness historic processes in the world and participate in them," Mircea Constantinescu, former deputy chief of the staff of Warsaw Treaty United Armed Forces, told TASS.

According to Constantinescu, he and other generals representing the former allied armies, "have the difficult task of fulfilling the final act: to close the curtain and lower flags".

He praised the previous activities of the defensive alliance, noting that the accumulated experience of multilateral military cooperation would be useful for future bilateral relations or a pan-European security system.

"We Romanians have fulfilled our allied obligations, and we are proud of this," Constantinescu stressed.

The last Warsaw Treaty military representatives from Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Bulgaria will leave Moscow over the next three days.

Commander-in-Chief of the Warsaw Treaty United Armed Forces Petr Lushev and Chief of the Warsaw Treaty Staff Vladimir Lobov will surrender their powers on March 31.

Belorussian National Front Congress Held 25 Mar

LD2603140691 Minsk Domestic Service in Belorussian 0300 GMT 26 Mar 91

[Text] The Congress of the Belorussian National Front (BNF) ended in Minsk yesterday. Zenon Poznyak delivered a political report. Appraising the two-year work, its leader noted that a significant number of the republic's citizens has, under the impact of the BNF, fundamentally changed its attitudes to socialism, to the role of the CPSU and to the history and culture of Belorussia, while the BNF itself has evolved from reliable cooperation with the better forces of the CPSU to outright anti-communism.

The rapporteur and other speakers noted that during its two and half years' existence, the BNF has not become a general mass national movement. In their view, this can only be explained by a low level of national conscience.

Having recognized that the BNF is a real force, with which one must cooperate, Viktor Ukhlanov, instructor of the Communist Party of Belorussia Central Committee—who spoke as guest of the congress—stated that the Communist Party of Belorussia also constitutes an important force and one that must be taken into consideration.

The congress adopted a program statement and approved the charter of the BNF. Zenon Poznyak was once more elected its chairman.

Caucasus

S. Ossetian CP Appeals to Gorbachev on Violence

LD2703090391 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 27 Mar 91

[Text] The secretary of the South Ossetian regional committee of the Communist Party [CP] of Georgia, Gassiyev, has sent a telegram to the USSR president saying that the situation in South Ossetia has worsened. He says that as of yesterday 53 persons on the Ossetian side alone have been killed and over 230 wounded. Gassiyev demanded that the situation in South Ossetia be discussed in the USSR Supreme Soviet and that a state of emergency be introduced in the entire territory of the region by the forces of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs.

Georgia's Gamsakhurdia Sums Talks With Yeltsin

LD2603123391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0921 GMT 26 Mar 91

[By TASS special correspondent Igor Gvritishiliy]

[Text] Tbilisi, 26 Mar (TASS)—Zviad Gamsakhurdia, chairman of the Georgian Supreme Soviet, informed viewers of the coming signing of a new "interstate agreement" between Georgia and Russia.

He spoke late last night on the local television network and revealed the results of his meeting with Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, which took place on 23 March in the village of Kazbegi in Georgia. Zviad Gamsakhurdia noted that the talks were "very constructive, promising, and beneficial" for Georgia. He underlined that an agreement has been reached between the two sides on the setting up of a working commission, which is to work out a draft of a new agreement in April between Georgia and Russia. The agreement will then be signed in Tbilisi.

The leader of the Georgian legislature also said the signing of a joint protocol that includes a range of measures directed at the stabilization of the situation in Samachablo (what South Ossetia is called here now) is another result of his meeting with Boris Yeltsin. To carry this out it was decided to set up a joint commission composed of representatives of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Georgia and Russia. After this, joint militia detachments will be set up to carry out the disarmament of Ossetian fighters who "penetrate into South Ossetia from the territory of North Ossetia." At the same time, both sides have to create all the conditions for the return of refugees to their places of previous residence.

According to Zviad Gamsakhurdia, Boris Yeltsin made the obligation on behalf of the Government of Russia to address the USSR Ministry of Defense with a request for the withdrawal of all forces deployed in South Ossetia

that are "hampering the stabilization of the situation in the region, and supplying Ossetian fighters with weapons and means of transport."

Zviad Gamsakhurdia paid special attention to the paragraph in the protocol where South Ossetia is mentioned as a "former autonomous oblast." He claims that, by this, Boris Yeltsin has actually recognized the legality of the abolition of this autonomous formation by the Georgian authorities.

Georgia Fails To Recognize Referendum Results

LD2703055891 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1900 GMT 26 Mar 91

[Text] The Georgian Supreme Soviet regards the results of the Union referendum as having no legal power in the republic. The indices of the referendum that was held in Abkhaziya and South Ossetia will not be taken into account. The results of the election of the USSR people's deputy which was held on 17 March in the Sukhumi electoral district No. 669 are also not recognized.

As a basis for these decisions the resolution of the Georgian Supreme Soviet Presidium puts forward the thesis that gross violation of the requirements of the USSR laws took place during voting.

Economic Problems, Incidents in NKAO Noted

NC2703010191 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1730 GMT 25 Mar 91

[Text] What is the state of the economy like in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] today? This question was put to Marsel Petrosyan, a responsible worker at the economic sector in Nagorno-Karabakh, by an ARMENPRES correspondent.

Petrosyan said: Let me note without any exaggeration that virtually all the enterprises in the oblast, including the foodstuff enterprises, have reached the critical level. Because of the blockade of the roads, raw materials and [word indistinct] equipment needed by the factories are frequently obtained via air. This is very expensive for the work collectives, which are already on the verge of bankruptcy.

There are special difficulties in the dispatch of our products to the Union consumers. Lately, the silk fabric sent by the Karabakh Silk Combine to its Georgian counterpart ended up in Sheki town on the orders of the Azerbaijani leadership. The reason is quite obvious: To force the people of Nagorno-Karabakh to sever their economic ties with other regions of the country.

The oblast owes tens of millions of rubles' worth of goods to the Union consumers.

The farmers are experiencing enormous problems during this spring sowing. There are no seeds, fuel, lubricants; the farm equipment is not ready, and the security of farmers and animal breeders is not ensured.

But the people of Nagorno-Karabakh are accustomed to overcoming even seemingly the most hopeless situation, no matter what their enemies do. I am sure everything will be done so that we can have bread, wine and marriages. You cannot blockade the work ethic. Eventually, the two sides will be forced to come to the negotiating table, for the use of force and economic blockade cannot produce anything beneficial, said Petrosyan at the end.

Let us add a few words on the current situation prevailing in Nagorno-Karabakh. Stepanakert's hospital has advised that three gravely injured Armenians were brought here on 23 March. They were injured in Kodzhaly town. Zdirayr (?Arabazyan) and Karen Mkrtichyan, residents of Stepanakert, received gunshot wounds near the same settlement on 24 March while travelling in their car. According to preliminary information, the crime was committed by persons wearing militia uniforms.

The press center of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation quotes a statement by the the internal affairs department of Shusha to the effect that on Friday, 22 March, a VAZ-469 car belonging to the Republican Organizational Committee came under fire on the Shusha-Lachin road. One of the passengers was killed, and the two severely injured ones were taken to the hospital in Lachin. The Shusha internal affairs department has not provided further information about the incident, arguing that the bad weather has prevented inspectors from conducting out a detailed investigation. Considering that the entrance of the Armenians to this region is virtually prohibited, it is assumed that the attackers were not Armenians.

According to information circulating these days, a few Azerbaijanis were also killed in Kodzhaly for unknown reasons. This information was not commented upon, either.

The law enforcement organs in Stepanakert believe that these killings are probably the result of internal antagonism among the Azerbaijanis. Antagonism exists between the Azerbaijani authorities and the National Front. In fact, it was because of the calls made by the National Front that only 25 percent of the population of Shushinskiy Rayon participated in the 17 March Union referendum.

TASS Details Incidents

LD2603202491 Moscow TASS in English 1952 GMT 26 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Vadim Byrkin]

[Text] Stepanakert March 26 TASS—Although the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh region is under control, it remains tense.

Reports on inter-ethnic crimes have become a daily routine in the region.

An Armenian citizen was kidnapped near the village of Talysh in Mardakert District yesterday. He was driven away towards Mir-Bashir district of Azerbaijan and killed there.

Another Armenian citizen was admitted to a hospital in Stepanakert in a critical condition.

He and another Armenian were heavily wounded by unknown people in militia uniform from a car without licence plates in Askeran District.

Last week, unidentified people fired at a car with Azerbaijanis near the village of Desyat Verst, burnt down last January, in Shusha District, killing a woman and wounding two Azerbaijanis.

Valentin Zhukov, the commandant of the district under state of emergency in Nagorno-Karabakh and contiguous districts of Azerbaijan, called on the local population to remain calm and stop the escalation of crime.

A total of 44 people, including nine servicemen, were killed in the region in 1991.